Poetry and Censorship in Counter-Reformation Italy

Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions

Edited by

Andrew Colin Gow (*Edmonton, Alberta*)

In cooperation with

Sylvia Brown (*Edmonton, Alberta*)
Falk Eisermann (*Berlin*)
Berndt Hamm (*Erlangen*)
Johannes Heil (*Heildelderg*)
Susan C. Karant-Nunn (*Tucson, Arizona*)
Martin Kaufhold (*Augsburg*)
Erik Kwakkel (*Leiden*)
Jürgen Miethke (*Heidelberg*)
Christopher Ocker (*San Anselmo and Berkeley, California*)

Founding Editor

Heiko A. Oberman †

VOLUME 189

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/smrt*

Poetry and Censorship in Counter-Reformation Italy

By

Jennifer Helm

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Poesis, the Allegory of Poetry. Ceiling of the House of the Signature. Artist: Raphael, 1510.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Helm, Jennifer.
Poetry and censorship in Counter-Reformation Italy / by Jennifer Helm.
pages cm. — (Studies in medieval and Reformation traditions, ISSN 1573-4188 ; v. 189)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-28439-5 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-30111-5 (e-book)
1. Italian poetry—16th century—History and criticism. 2. Censorship—Italy—History—16th century. 3. Censorship—Religious aspects—Christianity—History—16th century. 4. Catholic Church. Congregatio Indicis. 5. Index librorum prohibitorum. I. Title.

PQ4103.H37 2015
851'.409—dc23

2015021695

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities.
For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1573-4188
ISBN 978-90-04-28439-5 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-30111-5 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Preface VII
Acknowledgements XII
List of Abbreviations XIII
Document Finding List XIV

1 Control of Literature as a Strategy of Catholic Reformation: Motives and Modes of Influence 1

2 Approaching Censorial Reading 17
2.1 The Virgin Text 17
2.2 Who is the Author of a Sinful Texts? 23
2.3 The Author in Censorship Practice 29
2.4 Tracing the Imagined Reader 34

3 Mechanisms of the Roman *Index* 41
3.1 The *Libri Omnes* Principle 41
3.2 On the Censorship of Literary Genres 45
3.3 An Attempt to Manipulate 'Stylistic' Modes of Writing? 49
3.4 Reflections on Criteria of the *Inquisitio* of Texts 55

4 Censures of the Marvelous 62
4.1 A Prohibition of Wonders? 62
4.2 The Marvelous, Characters and Action 78
4.2.1 Human Characters and Animals with Supernatural Powers 78
4.2.2 Supernatural Beings 84
4.2.3 Objects and Places 102
4.3 Marvel and Fate 107
4.4 Censorship and Guided Reading 124
4.5 Shaping Narrative Structures—On the Fantastic 134

5 Censures of Love 138
5.1 On Freedom and 'Reality' of the Word 144
5.2 Forbidden Goddesses 153
5.3 Disillusioning the Lover 166
5.4 Intimacy Locked Away: Trimming Literary Genres 184

6 Censoring Laughter 196
6.1 Sensitivity of Verbal Expression 201
6.2 Privileged Treatment of Italian Vernacular Poetry and National Sentiment? 207
6.3 Hidden Dangers in Comic Poetry 220

7 Self-Censorship and Poetic Counter-Strategies: The Case of Domenico Venier 230
7.1 Between Publication and Censorship 230
7.2 A Poetic Apology of Love Lyrics? 237
7.2.1 Embedding the Story and Defining Love 240
7.2.2 Love and Freedom 247
7.2.3 Contemplation and Enlightenment 251
7.2.4 Self-Reflection and Anticipated Conversion 258
7.2.5 Martyrdom and Deification 262
7.2.6 An Attempt to Speak of Two Loves at the Same Time 265
7.2.7 A New Way of Contemplation and an Untypical End 271
7.3 A New Book Project or Censorship? 275

Conclusion 280

Appendices

Editorial Notes 291
Documents 1: Cases and Judgments 292
Documents 2: Relating Documents 403
Bibliography 412
Index of Names 435

Preface

Counter-Reformation censorship was not only about the suppression or correction of books. First and foremost, it was about man. When the Roman Catholic Church published an *Index of Prohibited Books* (*Index Librorum Prohibitorum*),[1] it was not initially presented to the public as a rigorous control instrument; rather, Pope Pius IV declared that the *Index* was to inform Catholics of books that they were not to read. His desire was to provide for the salvation of Catholic souls ("nos saluti animorum consulere"). It is thus to be understood as a remedy ("remedium") for the large number of common errors about the faith and morals of the time. The *Index* clearly implied rigorous controls and punishments to ensure efficiency.[2]

Why reading was considered a potential danger to the soul, is explained by Pope Clement VIII in his *Index* of 1596. Books, he maintains, affect their readers. Books can infect incautious minds with hidden poison during the reading process ("qui incautas fidelium mentes occulto veneno inficientes").[3] In his view, readers are involved in a relation with the book while reading. Incautious readers cannot defend themselves from unconsciously receiving harmful contents. Censorship should therefore control books, the reading experience and, ultimately, man. For this reason poetry was to be included in censorship.

Counter-Reformation censorship implied the control of human belief, thought, imagination and emotion. Man's inner life was put under control. The censorship of poetry became more and more important to the Roman censorial authorities. Since the Middle Ages poetry had been undergoing important developments: it had freed itself from the restrictions dictated by the Catholic faith and morals and it had begun to explore and express thoughts, beliefs, feelings and imaginings which did not necessarily conform to the Catholic faith and morals. Poetry, however, was only a reflection of crucial changes in intellectual, social, political and religious life where man moved to center stage along with his faculties, weaknesses and role on earth. Poetry became man's mirror; it could express everything regarding human life, including what was not to be thought, believed, felt or imagined. Poetry's development was therefore put under surveillance.

---

1 The exact title of the *Index* of 1558/59 was *Index auctorum et librorum qui ab officio Sanctae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis caveri ab omnibus et singulis in universa Christiana Republica mandantur*. Subsequent editions were titled *Index librorum prohibitorum*.

2 Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*, *Index* of 1564, in *Index des livres interdits*, ed. by Jésus Martínez De Bujanda (Montréal: Médiaspaul, 1984–2002), viii, 805 and 804 (hereafter *ILI*).

3 *Instructio eorum, qui libris tum prohibendis, tum expurgandis, tum etiam imprimendis, diligentem ac fidelem* (*ut par est*) *operam sunt daturi*, *Index* of 1596, in *ILI*, ix, 924.

To a certain degree poetry's development was restricted and forced either to find new ways of expression or to wait to reawaken in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Sixteenth-century literary history and censorship files show that all elements of poetry, such as characters, actions and motifs, as well as manners of writing (later called style) and literary genres, were involved. Poetry continued to develop, but some elements, manners of writing and genres disappeared while others were altered and new ones discovered.

This book seeks to draw attention to and elucidate potential links between poetry and censorship. It endeavors to provide material for a better understanding of both poetry and censorship and to suggest topics for further research. As Pius IV stated, behind all the control lay an interest in man, so the study of the control of poetry may help to elucidate the Counter-Reformation attempt to control the Church and, in a wider sense, man.

That the Counter-Reformation heavily impacted Italian vernacular poetry has been largely accepted in recent research on sixteenth-century censorship, cultural politics and poetry.[4] Critics have paid particular attention to the cases of Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, Giovanni Boccaccio's *Decamerone* and Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, and there is increasing interest in Antonfrancesco Doni's works, Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* and Simon Fornari's commentary on the *Furioso*.[5] A common method of examining censorship has been to compare the original and expurgated versions of a work, as studies on Castiglione and Doni demonstrate. Differences between versions have been described and interpreted in order to establish and account for the motives of censorship. Such studies are important because they prove the impact of censorship on poetry and show that texts were radically altered.

---

4 Ugo Rozzo, *La letteratura italiana negli Indici del Cinquecento* (Urbino, Forum, 2006), G. Fragnito, *Proibito capire: la Chiesa e il volgare nella prima età moderna* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2005) et al.

5 See e.g. Annamaria Coseriu, 'Zensur und Literatur in der italienischen Renaissance des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Baldassar Castigliones *Libro del Cortegiano* als Paradigma', in Alfred Noyer-Weidner (ed.), *Literatur zwischen immanenter Bedingtheit und äußerem Zwang. Zwei Studien zum Cinquecento* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1987), Vittorio Cian, 'Un episodio della storia della censura in Italia nel secolo XVI: l'edizione spurgata del Cortigiano', *Archivio storico Lombardo,* 2nd ser., 14/4 (1887), 661–727, Giuseppe Chiecchi, *Dolcemente dissimulando*: *cartelle Laurenziane e Decameron censurato* (*1573*) (Padua: Antenore, 1992), 4, Chiecchi and Luciano Troisio, *Il Decameron sequestrato. Le tre edizioni nel Cinquecento* (Milan: Unicopli, 1984), Raul Mordenti, 'Le due censure: la collazione dei testi del *Decameron* "rassettati"', in *Le pouvoir et la plume. Incitation, contrôle et repression dans la literature du XVI^e siècle*, Actes du Colloque international organisé par le Centre Interuniversitaire de Recherche sur la Renaissance italienne et l'Institut Culturel Italien de Marseille, Aix-en-Provence, Marseille, 14–16 mai 1981 (Paris: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1982), 253–73, Peter M. Brown, 'I veri promotori della "rassettatura" del *Decameron* nel 1582', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 134 (1957), 314–32, Wiltrud Summer-Schindler, *Zensur und Involution. Aspekte gegenreformatorischer Überformung der italienischen Renaissancenovelle* (Aachen: Shaker, 1998).

The outcomes of this method, however, are limited. The interpretation of differences between print versions is not precise enough because it does not always include the censor's standpoint. This method deals only with the result of the expurgation; that is, with the corrected book. It does not take into account questions, problems or other aspects that influenced the assessment and led to the final outcome. What is more, it does not consider criticisms that may have been discussed by censors but, for various reasons, appear to have had no effect on the expurgated versions.

Other studies have shown that the Vatican Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (hereafter ACDF) and Vatican Apostolic Library (hereafter BAV) hold censorial documents on various cases of censorship of poetry. The ACDF plays a key role in such studies because it contains the archives of the former Roman censorial authorities, the Congregation for the Index and the Roman Inquisition. The archival materials of the ACDF and BAV offer insights into the background and motives for the censorship of poetry. They include censorial minutes, judgments and supplementary materials, which reveal the censors' thoughts, judgments, methods and intentions. They can therefore help to better understand sixteenth-century censorship politics and its impact on poetry. They raise questions and offer new perspectives and starting points for philological research, especially the study of the censorship of poetry and the impact of sixteenth-century censorship on contemporary poetic creation and theory.

Since the ACDF did not open until 1998, earlier studies did not include these materials. Contrary to expectation, the number of philological studies on the ACDF files on poetry is quite small. They are nevertheless important because they have published censorial documents or excerpts, investigated the historical circumstances surrounding the cases and described reasons for the censorship. These studies are usually dedicated to single cases, however, and do not bring results together for a broader understanding.[6] This may well be due to

6 M. Deramaix, '"Inepta et indecora comparatio: sacris prophana miscere". Une censure ecclésiastique post-tridentine et inédite du *De partu Virginis* de Jacopo Sannazaro pour Nadine Robert', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (1991), 173–93, Peter Godman, *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine Between Inquisition and Index* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), Maria Antonietta Passarelli, 'Ein Beispiel für die Zensur vulgärsprachlicher Texte: Simone Fórnaris Kommentar zum *Orlando furioso*', in *Inquisition, Index und Zensur: Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001), 279–91, ead., 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor* in una censura (non più anonima) di Gabriele Barri (ms. Vat. lat. 6149, ff. 142r–150v)', *Critica del testo*, VI/1 (2003), 177–220, Gigliola Fragnito, '"Vanissimus et spurchissimus homo": Ariosto all'esame dei censori', in *Dalla bibliografia alla storia. Studi in onore di Ugo Rozzo*, ed. by Rudj Gorian (Udine: Forum, 2010), 107–29, Simone Ragagli, '"Né contra la religione né i buoni costumi". Alcune osservazioni su censura ecclesiastica e *Lettere volgari* nel secondo Cinquecento', *Rivista di Storia e letteratura Religiosa*, 1 (2005), 193–219, Clizia Carminati, *Giovanni Battista Marino tra inquisizione e censura* (Rome: Ed. Antenore, 2008).

the new source and research situation; in any case, the philological examination of the judgments is still in need of scholarly attention.

This book endeavors to demonstrate how the study of censorship can be of interest for literary studies, and how literary studies can be employed in the field of censorship. To me the need to do this is evident in the great developments and changes in the sixteenth century onward. On a broader scale the study of censorship can help to better understand developments in sixteenth-century literary history and the subsequent implications of censorship on poetic creation and reception. In the smaller context, it can help to define more clearly the intentions behind the censorship of poetry and explain why some texts were expurgated or prohibited while others were not.

One potential field of study is the censorial reception of profane poetry. It could include ways and methods of reading and understanding poetic texts, the approach to fiction and complex polysemous structures as well as censorial criteria that influenced assessments. Another field could be the impact of censorship on sixteenth-century poetic creation, theory and the development of literary genres. Yet in order to approach such studies and connect them for a broader understanding, a new philological approach is needed. It should combine methods of historical and philological research and provide both a better understanding of Counter-Reformation censorship on the one hand, and the history, creation and theory of Italian poetry on the other hand.

This study suggests one new approach. It will hear Counter-Reformation censors speak about poetry and reflect upon the effect of their criticism and censorship on the creation and reception of poetry. It is based on profound archival research in the ACDF and BAV in order to extend and elucidate the small and incomplete body of known sources on various censorship cases of profane vernacular poetry through scarcely known documents. Transcriptions of the major part of the sources used here are supplied in the appendix.

The material was produced in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italy by the central censorial authorities of Rome and collaborating local inquisitions. It deals with Italian vernacular poetry of several genres as well as theoretical works on poetry and philosophy of the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. It discusses themes and imagery pertaining to the medieval poetic tradition and includes assessments of Latin, Spanish and French works. This book seeks to concentrate on philological themes, such as the roles of the author and reader, literary genres and modes of writing in censorship strategies as well as popular materials such as the 'marvelous' and 'fantastic,' love and the comic, and finally self-censorship in poetic creation.

This book is primarily based on three questions: 1) What were the criteria for Counter-Reformation censorship? 2) How did censors read, understand and

interpret profane vernacular poetry, for instance, its complex semantic structures and fictionality? 3) What were the implications of the assessments for the creative process and poetic theory? In addressing these questions, this study combines two levels of investigation, one comprising the censorial reception of poetry and poetics, the other the historical context of censorship. By examining the criticisms of profane poetic works, the study determines the criteria of assessment and the way they were applied in the field of poetry, and considers other influences, such as political and cultural interests. It looks behind the scenes to establish relationships between cases and judgments, filter the censors' methods of reading poetry, and identify paradigms of assessment. It will take a closer look at the censors' awareness of and approach to poetic writing strategies, including counter-strategies employed to hide ideas in the semantic structure of a literary text.

In order to present material clearly and make it accessible for further literary studies, this book is subdivided into three main thematic fields carved out of the censorship files that are typical of vernacular poetry: the 'marvelous', love and laughter. It examines judgments regarding these three fields as to how censors dealt with fiction, polysemy and complex stylistic means. It considers the implications of these assessments for the creative poetic process and theoretic developments, such as the design of action, characters, objects, speech and narrative structures of the 'marvelous' and 'fantastic,' love stories and the comic. It will reflect upon the consequences of censorship on the freedom of poetic language and means, the imitation of poetic models judged to contain errors and sins, and intimacy as a characteristic of early modern poetry. It will also look at the censorial investigation into religious elements in love poetry, which even included possible relationships to mystical and Protestant works. Some light may be shed on the cases of Dante, Petrarch and Ariosto which, due to less transparent censorship measures, still appear somewhat mysterious.

Eventually, the theme of censorship will be approached from a different angle: How did Counter-Reformation censorship affect poetic creation, increase self-control and counter-strategies in poetic writing? Both a poet and lay censor, Venier worked on a manuscript *canzoniere* for about a decade in the 1550s, rewriting and refining his work. The manuscript became a kind of sketchbook containing numerous corrections and poem sketches. In the mid-1550s, he worked as a lay censor for Venetian censorial authorities. This study seeks to analyze and, where applicable, shed light on Venier's work in the context of results of preceding investigations.

Some results of this study have already been published in articles.

Acknowledgements

This book emerged from a doctoral thesis accepted by the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Göttingen, Germany in 2010, and so thanks go to my supervisors Professor Franziska Meier and Professor Tobias Brandenberger for their support. I especially thank Franziska Meier for giving me the opportunity to write this book.

I would also like to express my deep gratitude to the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes and the Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani in Venice for granting research funding which made this book possible, including numerous research visits to Vatican City, Italy and Ireland.

This book could not have been written without the precious archival materials. I am very much indebted and grateful to the personnel of the Archive of the Congregation for the doctrine of the faith, especially its archivist Daniel Ponziani, the Vatican Library, the National Library of St Mark's in Venice, the State Archives of Venice, the Biblioteca dell'Archiginnasio in Bologna and the Trinity College Library in Dublin.

Likewise, I would to thank Brill for publishing this book, the editor-in-chief Professor Andrew Gow for accepting it in the series *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions*, Monica MacFadzean for editing and refining the English and, last but not least, an anonymous reader of Brill.

Jennifer Helm
Göttingen, 1 July 2015

List of Abbreviations

ACDF	Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Vatican
A R	Ludovico Ariosto, *Rime*
ASV	State Archives of Venice
BAV	Vatican Apostolic Library, Vatican
BNM	National Library of St Mark's, Venice
B R	Pietro Bembo, *Rime*
DC	Dante Alighieri, *Divina Commedia*
GC	Torquato Tasso, *Gerusalemme conquistata*
GL	Torquato Tasso, *Gerusalemme liberata*
ILI	Jesús Martínez De Bujanda, *Index des livres interdits*
Inf.	Dante Alighieri, *Inferno*
OF	Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando furioso*
OI	Matteo Maria Boiardo, *Orlando innamorato*
Par.	Dante Alighieri, *Paradiso*
PLL	Gabriele Barrio, *Pro lingua latina*
Purg.	Dante Alighieri, *Purgatorio*
RVF	Francis Petrarch, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*
S R	Jacopo Sannazaro, *Rime / Sonetti e canzoni*
TC	Francis Petrarch, *Triumphus cupidinis*

Document Finding List

Alighieri, Dante, 1.3, 1.3a, 1.3g
Alunno, Francesco, 1.7, 1.7o, 1.13, 1.13a–b
Arienti, Giovanni, Sabadino degli, 1.10, 1.10c
Ariosto, Ludovico, 1.2, 1.2a–b, f, 1.3, 1.3a, h, 1.4, 1.4a–e, 1.5, a–c, 1.6, 1.7, 1.7b
Barrio, Gabriele, 1.3, 1.3a–f (see Petrarch), 1.3g (see Dante), 1.3h (see Ariosto), 1.3i (see Sannazaro)
Bandello, Matteo, 1.10, 1.10d
Bembo, Pietro, 1.2, 1.2a, c–f, 1.3a
Bentivoglio, Ercole, 1.7, 1.7d
Bonardo, Vincenzo, 2.2
Castelvetro, Lodovico, 1.12, 1.12a–c
Castiglione, Baldassare, 1.7, 1.7g, 1.9
Ciccarelli, Antonio, 1.14, 1.14a–c (see Gozze)
Della Casa, Giovanni, 1.10, 1.10g
Doni, Antonfrancesco, 1.7, 1.7h, i, k, n
Fornari, Simon, 1.6 (see Ariosto)
Folengo, Teofilo, 1.7, 1.7a, 1.8
Galletti, Tommaso, 1.4, 1.4a–f (see Ariosto, Gonzaga)
Giovanni Fiorentino, 1.10, 1.10f
Gonzaga, Luigi, 1.4, 1.4f
Gozze, Niccolò Vito de, 1.14, 1.14a–c
Guarini da Centula, Vincenzo, 1.12, 1.12a (see Castelvetro)
Letters, vernacular, 1.7, 1.7l, 1.11, 1.11a–d
Mantova Benavides, Marco, 1.7, 1.7m (see Petrarch)
Parabosco, Girolamo, 1.10, 1.10e
Paterno, Lodovico, 1.7, 1.7e
Petrarch, Francis, 1.3, 1.3a–f (also 1.3h), 1.7, 1.7m (see Mantova Benavides)
Sannazaro, Jacopo, 1.2, 1.2e–f, 1.3, 1.3a, i
Sansovino, Francesco, 1.2, 1.2c (see Ariosto), 1.2f (see Bembo), 1.7, 1.7f, 1.10, 1.10b
Sixtus V, 2.1
Speroni, Sperone, 1.1
Straparola, Gianfrancesco, 1.10, 1.10a
Valier, Agostino, 2.3

CHAPTER 1

Control of Literature as a Strategy of Catholic Reformation

Motives and Modes of Influence

> La materia de' libri par cosa di poco momento perché tutta di parole, ma da quelle parole vengono le opinioni del mondo che causano le parzialità, le sedizioni e finalmente le guerre. Sono parole sì, ma che in conseguenza tirano eserciti armati.
>
> PAOLO SARPI

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the influence of poetry was being debated by the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–1517). The mandate of the Council, convened by Pope Julius II, was to lessen conflict between Christians by bringing about reforms that would both increase the number of members of the faith and combat errors and heresies. The role of poetry in reform politics emerges from two decrees issued by the Council under the Medici Pope Leo X, the successor of Julius II: *Apostolici regiminis* (1513) and *Inter sollicitudines* (1515). They reveal that the control of poetry, its study and publication was considered important for the Catholic Reformation. *Apostolici regiminis* was a significant step towards controlling and influencing not only the Church's faith but also its knowledge base, while *Inter sollicitudines* supplied an instrument for this control by introducing universal pre-censorship in the Roman Church in 1515.[1]

The *Apostolici regiminis* declares that Satan, "the sower of cockle" ("zizaniae seminator"), "the old enemy of the human race" ("antiquus humani generis hostis"), is responsible for misinterpretations of the Catholic faith, and that these misinterpretations were being adopted by philosophers in support of their respective philosophies. One such misinterpretation centered on the mortality of the soul. The Council "condemns and repudiates" ("damnamus & reprobamus") anyone who denies the immortality of the soul, insists on the existence of a single soul for all human beings, and expresses doubts about the Catholic faith in this respect. All statements contravening the Catholic

1 Parts of this chapter have already been published in my article 'Philologie, Übersetzungen und das Dekret *Inter sollicitudines* zur Vorzensur (1515)', in Christoph Strosetzki (ed.), *Übersetzung—Ursprung und Zukunft der Philologie?* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2008), 195–212.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_002

truth are defined as "false". The decree rejects the possibility of 'double truth', the theory that an idea proven incorrect in theology could still be considered true in philosophy. All philosophers teaching publicly were compelled to teach only Catholic "truths", and, when dealing with heterodox positions, they were obliged to point out the fallacies.[2] This measure was possibly put into place due to the insistence of some philosophers that the mortality of the soul was supported by philosophy.

The *Apostolici regiminis* refers to poetry twice in the context of education, both times in connection with philosophy, and as a potential source of heterodox ideas within the faith itself. The decree metaphorically explains that in order to successfully combat errors about the faith it does not suffice to merely sever the errors at their roots; rather, it is necessary to destroy the roots altogether in order to prevent errors and heresies from blooming once again. These dangerous roots are described as "infected" ("infectae"), products of Satan's seed contaminated by his ill will. According to the decree, the roots of poetry and philosophy were infected, rendering them instruments of Satan.

Education was considered an instrument that could be used to combat such errors. The Council strove to control educational institutions and admonish philosophers in their teaching. It decreed that if members of religious and secular orders wished to study philosophy or poetry at universities or other public institutions for periods of longer than five years, they were to embrace the study of theology or canon law so that the "infected roots" of philosophy and poetry could be "cleansed". Poetry was to be controlled, as it was considered a source of heterodox and heretical ideas and beliefs.

Education, especially the teaching, studying and understanding of philosophy and poetry, became a conduit for Catholic reform. Given that the study and interpretation of poetry was exclusively the domain of members of secular and religious orders, one might question the importance of examining the degree to which the *Apostolici regiminis* influenced the censorship of profane poetry and literature. Aside from the obvious fact that a large number of clergy were teachers of laypeople, one can find an answer to this question by examining a program for church reform entitled *Libellus ad Leonem X*, which two Camaldulensian monks, Piero Querini and Paolo Giustinian, presented to Pope Leo X shortly after his election. There is debate among critics as to the degree to which the *Libellus* influenced the *Apostolici regiminis* because the

2 See E.A. Constant, 'A Reinterpretation of the Fifth Lateran Council Decree *Apostolici regiminis* (1513)', in *Sixteenth-Century Journal*, XXXIII/2 (2002), 353–79, 363. For an overview of different interpretations of this decree see ibid.

two texts show significant analogies.[3] It is important to note that both texts address the spread of heterodox ideas and identify philosophy and poetry as potential sources, positing the necessity of educational reform and imposed control of knowledge and understanding.

In their *Libellus*, Giustinian and Querini observed that ignorance, superstition, avarice and other vices were on the rise in the Church. Ignorance, they believed, was the most dangerous ("maximum et malorum omnium caput causamque ignorantiam esse"). Together with ignorance of the faith, it was particularly threatening if sown by the devil among clerics, who could infect the laity.[4] Some clerics, they explain, dedicate themselves to literary studies and the lies of poets rather than to Christian piety. Giustinian and Querini strove to convince the pope of the necessity of educational reform, particularly for members of religious orders. A universal church reform could most effectively be realized if the clerics were better educated, but on the whole a reform of "depraved literary studies" ("depravata litterarum studia"), including pagan literature, was considered indispensable. Giustinian and Querini were not against the poetic or philosophical works of ancient authors but considered the poetic and literary works of their contemporaries poor replicas of early pagan writings, products of depravity that should not be allowed.[5]

In addition to educational reform, the two monks clearly demanded censorship of contemporary writing, a request that was granted by Leo X in 1515 in his *Inter sollicitudines*. The pope was requested to restore pagan studies in the context of divine and sacred literature ("sacras litteras") for, without faith, the study of pagan poets, orators and other authors would be without merit. Giustinian and Querini went so far as to recommend replacing the study of pagan tales and orators with Christian truths and Christian writers as well as Latin and Greek works of Christian historiographers and orators.[6]

The concept of church reform, especially in regard to the religious and the clergy, was not actually initiated by the two Camaldulensians. Similar ideas of reform had formerly been considered and slated to be addressed at a council scheduled to be held shortly after the 1503 election of Pope Julius II. The new pope reneged on his promise, resulting in an illegal council being held in Pisa in 1511/12 at the instigation of King Louis II and supported by Emperor

3 See *Pauli Justiniani et Petri Quirini eremitarum Camaldulensium Libellus ad Leonem X Pontificem Maximum*, in *Annales Camaldulenses Ordinis Sancti Benedicti* (Venice: Monasterium Sancti Michaelis de Muriano, 1773), ix, cf. Constant; Felix Gilbert, 'Cristianesimo, umanesimo e la Bolla "Apostolici Regiminis" del 1513', *Rivista storica italiana*, 90 (1967), 976–90.

4 Cf. Giustinian and Querini, 674–6.

5 Ibid. 675–7.

6 Ibid. 677.

Maximilian I. The Council of Pisa desired reform of the entire Church ("in capite et in membris . . .") and planned to invite not only prelates, kings, princes and other political leaders, but also *collegia* and *universitates* of *studia generalia*, generals of the religious orders and teachers.[7] The Council of Pisa was eventually suspended by Julius II, who summoned the Fifth Lateran Council held in the Basilica San Giovanni in Laterano in Rome the following year, continuing the themes addressed at Pisa. In the same year, Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, soon to become Pope Leo X, was in Florence, presiding over a general chapter of the entire Camaldulensian Order. Giustinian and Querini were also present. Upon the death of Julius II Giovanni de' Medici was elected pope, and the two monks presented him with the *Libellus*, which had been produced either during or shortly after their stay in Florence. The collaboration between Giustinian, Querini and Giovanni de' Medici and the subsequent *Libellus* could perhaps be considered a mere coincidence had not another council followed immediately after the Fifth Lateran Council. The Council of Florence (1517/18) was convened by another powerful member of the Medici family, Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, a cousin of Leo X, archbishop of Florence and vice-chancellor of the Roman Church. At that time Florence was the center of Renaissance humanism, which might have influenced the measures eventually taken at the Fifth Lateran Council.

Felix Gilbert has suggested that contemporary intellectual developments, especially the laicizing tendencies of humanistic studies, led to the Lateran decree *Apostolici regiminis*.[8] The reform of the pagan studies addressed by Giustinian and Querini in the *Libellus* very clearly refers to humanistic studies, particularly as practiced in Florence in the fifteenth century. Classicism had melded with Florentine culture to the extent that humanistic studies even influenced politics, leading to a new form of humanism that Hans Baron referred to as "civic humanism", as well as to an educational system that aimed to teach each student how to become a member of his society and state as a free man ("uomo libero").[9] Humanistic studies brought about changes in

7 See *Convocatio Conciliabuli Pisani per Cardinales schismaticos edita*, in Joannis Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Paris: Hubertus Welter, 1902), xxxv, 158.

8 Cf. Gilbert, 978 and 987, Joseph Hilgers, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1904), 395.

9 See Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 1967), 459–60; Franco Cardini and Cesare Vasoli, 'Rinascimento e Umanesimo', in *Storia della letteratura italiana*, ed. Enrico Malato, iii: *Il '400* (Rome: Salerno, 1996), 73.

ethical views, such as a new sense of obligation among scholars to actively engage in civil and political life.

Humanism entailed a different awareness of the present, a growing self-consciousness and self-responsibility as well as emancipated patterns of thought, which led to a proliferation of humanistic literature on a wide range of topics. Aside from writing commentaries on classical literature, humanists strove to use pagan wisdom to improve contemporary politics, education, family and civil life, as well as philosophy, in particular ethics, poetry, general arts, architecture and music. Humanists also undertook to defend poetry against scholastic accusations of falsehood, immorality and uselessness. Classical poetry was defended by Boccaccio, and at the end of the fourteenth century Coluccio Salutati's concept of poetry as the "theology of the poets" ("theologia poetarum") was an attempt to reconcile Christian religion with classical mythology.[10] The priest Marsilio Ficino adopted Plato's concept of divine frenzy, maintaining that poets could express higher truths and "prophetic meanings" through divine inspiration.[11] From such a perspective poetry could be understood and perceived as a source of knowledge in educational institutions and beyond, a potential source of heterodox ecclesiastical ideas, as apparent in the *Apostolici regiminis*.

Florence was the source of the new humanistic development that was spreading throughout Italy. Of course, this did not occur without provoking criticism, objections, and accusations of "pagan tendencies."[12] For this reason it is of great importance that Giustinian and Querini's *Libellus* suggests a reform of the educational system by means of a reorientation of all studies from humanistic to divine, and demands the suppression of works of contemporary thinkers and commentaries on pagan literature. The relation between the *Libellus* and the two Lateran decrees sheds further light on the issue.

In 1515, two years after the promulgation of the *Apostolici regiminis*, Leo X institutionalized universal pre-censorship for the entire Catholic Church in *Inter sollicitudines*. The decree acknowledges the advantages of print by explaining that books of benefit for scholarly studies could be obtained at minimal expense by both sexes. The Council understood that this could

10 See Baron, 297, cf. Giovanni Boccaccio, *Genealogia: Boccaccio in Defense of Poetry, Genealogia deorum gentilium liber XIV*, ed. Jeremiah Reedy (Toronto: Hunter Rose, 1978), Coluccio Salutati, *De laboribus Herculis*, i, ed. B.L. Ullman (Turici: Thesaurus mundi, 1951), i, 3.

11 See Marsilio Ficino, *The Letters of Marsilio Ficino*, trans. members of the Department of the School of Economic Science London (London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 1978), i, the letter of 1 December 1457 to Peregrino Agli, 46.

12 Cf. Baron, 3–6, 291ss.

increase the number of learned Catholics who would be competent in various languages. It desired learned men to endeavor to use such knowledge to teach the infidel. Book printing, Leo X declared, was invented and developed by God, so it is little wonder that he wished it to be used in God's service for his glory to increase the faith and propagate the good arts ("... quod ad Dei gloriam, et fidei augmentum, ac bonarum artium propagationem salubriter est inventum"). On this basis, he was able to explain the necessity of censorship.

Several complaints about book printers had been voiced in several languages concerning the printing and selling of books that allegedly contained views that contravened the Catholic religion and threatened the reputations of high-ranking persons. These books are not defined by their titles or authors but by the languages in which they are written. The decree refers to Latin translations of Greek, Hebrew, Arabic and Chaldean books as well as to Latin and vernacular texts (it is not clear which vernacular tongue) and to printers in various parts of the Catholic world. The decree declares that such books lack utility and many readers had been seduced to errors about the faith, life and morals. This, it explains, had given rise to scandal, and more scandal could arise. So, besides pre-censorship and translations that may refer to humanistic work, the decree highlights two more aspects, the utility of a text and the reception of a text by a reader.[13]

Reading and its effects receive more attention in *Inter sollicitudines* than in *Apostolici regiminis*. At first glance, this difference might appear insignificant, as censorship of a text seems naturally linked to its consumption. Nevertheless, it is important to note a difference; this censorship measure was not solely about what was allowed to be said or written, it was also about what could result from the reading of a text and how a text could affect and influence the reader. This is another indicator that the Roman Church had sharpened its focus and would considerably shape Counter-Reformation censorship practice.

The efforts to combat abuse of the printed word were understandable given the belief that the printing press had been invented for the glory of the Christian God. The necessity of control instruments was implicit. Vivid images warned against the dangers of printing perilous books; thorns should not mingle with good seeds, poison must not mingle with medicine. The pope ordained that no publication of any kind was to be printed without first being examined by the vicar and master of the sacred palace in Rome or, in other cities and dioceses, by the local bishop or a person commissioned by him and the local inquisitor. *Inter sollicitudines* addresses all books and forms of writing, regardless of genre. Poetry was indirectly included in censorship measures

13 Cf. *Inter sollicitudines*.

under the general description of dangerous texts, which are listed according to the languages in which they were written.

Inter sollicitudines first refers to Latin texts translated from Greek, Hebrew, Arabic and Chaldean, which possibly include works by classical authors and early Christian writers. The descriptions of perilous texts are references to humanistic studies and works, specifically philological studies. The translations could also be commentaries on the accompanying translated texts by ancient authors. Since these texts had been written by humanists, it is clear why the control of humanistic studies at educational institutions was considered necessary.

It is the irony of history that in the fourteenth century the Roman Church had decided to further the study of languages of non-Christian peoples as well as of the translations of their literary, philosophical and religious texts (Council of Vienne, 6 May 1312) in order to better understand the beliefs of the infidel to facilitate missionary work.[14] Two hundred years later, the Roman Church had to acknowledge that its interactions with non-Christian cultures had brought about the necessity of guiding Christians back to Catholic orthodoxy.

The decree deals with texts originally written in Latin or the vernacular. Since it concerns all forms of writing, it includes literary texts. This is important given the references to vernacular works. At that time, in spite of important developments brought about by the *questione della lingua*, Latin was still the commonly used language of the liberal arts. Considering that a characteristic of dangerous texts, in addition to the language in which they were written, was defined as contents believed to contravene the faith, good morals and cause harm to the good name of a neighbor, the texts referred to could have included publications such as pamphlets and poetic works. In regard to matters of life and morality, vernacular love poetry and *romanzi* were scrutinized as well as pasquinades, satires and *facetiae*.

Since the Counter-Reformation Church's desire to control the soul implied total control of individuals (their thoughts, beliefs, understandings, imaginings and knowledge), both decrees of the Fifth Lateran Council must be understood in not only a religious context but also in a wider, intellectual context. They may be viewed as reactions to symptoms of a vast process in the history of ideas that had long since begun in Catholic countries. In the two preceding centuries, a variety of phenomena had emerged, labelled by some critics as

14 Cf. *Inter sollicitudines*, Council of Vienne, 6 May 1312, in *Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien*, ii, 379–80. Critics diverge on the question of whether or to what extent the decree was realized.

secularizations that appeared in nearly all facets of life.[15] The theme of the relation between poetry and intellectual emancipation ran like a golden thread through these phenomena and sixteenth-century censorship measures taken by the Fifth Lateran Council and, subsequently, other ecclesiastical authorities. As early as 1517/18 the Council of Florence sought to put the Lateran decrees into practice. In dealing with the *Apostolici regiminis*, education and poetry, it added elucidating constitutions, which were examined in Rome and approved by Leo X following the Council.

The Council files contain a section headed *De magistris deque hereticis Christianae fidei scandalizantibus*. Significantly, this section deals with teachers and heretics, demonstrating the level of importance given to education and the control and formation of the mind. It opens with an explanation of the reasons ("causas") for the reform measures. Poetry, as a subject included in the curriculum, is considered first. The Council addresses the position of local language and grammar teachers who maintained that they could only teach Latin to young people and shape their souls by using the epigrams of Catullus and Martial and love poems. These texts, however, were classified as lascivious and unchaste ("lasciva . . . Catulli, Martialis epigrammata," "quaecumque impudica de amoribus carmina").[16]

The Council of Florence seems to have already announced one of the general prohibitions of the Tridentine *Index*, *Rule* VII, which had an immense impact on literature, especially poetry. The adjective *lascivus* may be understood in the erotic sense, but in more general terms it means "free from restraint" ("1. playful, frisky, frolicsome, 2. given to levity or frivolity, 3. unruly, mischievous, naughty, free from restraint in sexual matters, 5. (of style) extravagant, unrestraint").[17] The latter definition makes sense with regard to the works of Catullus and Martial and accounts for the description of love poetry as unchaste yet not lascivious.

The teachers' position and teaching method were viewed as abuses because unsuitable texts were believed to corrupt the souls of young people. The reading of lascivious and impious poetry or other texts of that nature was thus pro-

15 Cf. Matthias Pohlig et al. (eds.), *Säkularisierungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: methodische Probleme und empirische Fallstudien* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 2008), R.F. Scribner, 'Reformation and Desacralization. From Sacramental World to Moralised Universe', in *Problems in the Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Europe*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997), 75–92.

16 Cf. *Concilium Florentinum*, in Mansi, xxxv, col. 269, *De magistris deque hereticis Christianae fidei scandalizantibus*, ch. 1.

17 Cf. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004).

hibited at schools. Significantly, the only example of prohibited texts given is Lucretius's didactic poem *De rerum natura*, which deals with the mortality of the soul. The files make it clear that the violation of this law was to be punished with excommunication, the payment of ten ducats and prison.[18] This is another example of how much importance the Roman Church placed on education, and that not only in Rome but in Florence as well poetry was considered a potential danger to good morals and the faith by some powerful people.

An entire poetic genre and manner of writing was to be suppressed according to another section of the Florentine files. The *Rubrica De festorum dierum observatione* encompasses the prohibition of the abuse of the Sacred Scripture for ridicule and obscene purposes. It explains that elements of the sacraments and the Catholic faith are made subjects of jokes and laughter, and that testimonies of the divine law and gestures used by priests during mass are imitated in texts about love and dances and recited and performed in public. It even criticizes a public recitation of the "Credo Margutti," a fictional credo of the character Margutte of Luigi Pulci's *Morgante*;[19] decades later it would be censored and corrected for the expurgated version of the *Morgante* published by Bartolommeo Sermatelli in Florence in 1574.[20]

The abuse of Sacred Scripture and the reference to Pulci's *Morgante* recall parodies of sacred, liturgical and hagiographical texts. Such parodies were quite popular at the beginning of the sixteenth century, employing themes from the Gospels as well as classical elegiac and bucolic texts. The parodies echoed a tradition begun in the Middle Ages with such works as *Cena Cypriani* and *Carmina Burana*. Due to recurring characteristics, critics have identified a poetic form in such parodies, an entire genre to which pertains, for instance, the sermon on love (*predica d'amore*).

The love sermon uses the form of the *sermo modernus*, the vernacular popular sermon, and imitates the art of preaching (*ars praedicandi*). Margutte's credo from Pulci's *Morgante* belongs to this genre, and parodies the Catholic Credo. Other examples are Jacopo Sannazaro's *Predica de' XII eremiti*, a love sermon, and the *Predica d'amore*, which has been attributed to Marco Rosiglia.[21]

---

18 Cf. *Concilium Florentinum*, in Mansi, xxxv, col. 270.

19 Ibid. col. 238, ch. 5.

20 See Andrea Sorrentino, *La letteratura italiana e il Sant'Uffizio* (Naples: Libreria Editrice Francesco Perella S.A., 1935), 334–5, cf. Coseriu, 71–2. On the correction of Pulci's *Morgante*, see below, 129.

21 Cf. Matteo Largaiolli, 'La Predica d'amore: note sulla parodia sacra tra Quattro e Cinquecento', *Italique* [En ligne], XI | 2008, mis en ligne le 01 février 2012, http://italique.revues.org/210, accessed 13 October 2012.

This kind of parody enjoyed great popularity during the fifteenth century, especially on feast days such as Carnival, so the Council of Florence addresses it in its section on the observance of feast days.

Shortly after the Florentine Medici pope introduced universal precensorship for the Catholic Church, the Council of Florence banned an entire poetic genre as well as the abusive use of the sacred in texts. A similar ban was decreed for the universal Church at the Council of Trent in 1546 (*Insuper eadem sacrosancta*), continuing this political line of thought. The Council of Trent wished to explicitly proscribe the abuse of words and sentences of the Sacred Scripture in profane contexts. It gave precise descriptions of various abusive forms of expression and content which it considered "irreverent" and "contemptible": wit, scurrilousness, vanity, flattery, detraction, superstition, impiousness, diabolical incantation, sorcery, and defamatory libel.[22]

This policy was carried forward in the first but unpromulgated Roman *Index* of 1557, which prohibited books, images, pictures, and artwork where the objects, words or sentences from Sacred Scripture or pertaining to the Catholic cult were abused in an impious or profane way, regardless of manner or quantity.[23] The subsequent *Index* did not explicitly express this prohibition, which, incidentally, had no effect on censorship politics, for the Tridentine decree was still in force.

Aside from religious and intellectual aspects, aesthetics come into play concerning poetry, especially secularizations of religious materials. Karlheinz Stierle identified the secularization of religious materials as a philological form of poetic aestheticization, having examined them in high and late medieval examples such as the courtly novella, the *lais* and poetic works by Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. According to Stierle, the arts had been the mouthpiece of Christianity for centuries. They had given up their "sensual directness" ("sinnliche Unmittelbarkeit") in order to become the "language of transcendence" ("Sprache der Transzendenz"). Since the High Middle Ages they had regained an autonomous function. Stierle explains that as early as the Early Middle Ages poets sought to create a "second transcendence" ("sekundäre Transzendenz") in this life through the poetic sublimation of the mundane. Means of poetic sublimation were rhyme, previously used in liturgy, religious language and material taken from Christian texts, such as accounts of

22 Cf. *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* of 8 April 1546, sessio IV, *Concilium Tridentinum*, in *Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien*, ed. Josef Wohlmuth (3rd edn., Paderborn: Schöningh, 1973), iii, 665.

23 Cf. *Index* of 1557, in *ILI*, viii, 738.

miracles.[24] One might add that pagan literature and mythologies also served this purpose. In order to draw a connection between this secular development and Roman Catholic censorship, it is important to note that poetic sublimation of the profane was achieved by combining it with the sacred. Using censorship as a means of intellectual control, the Roman Church defined printing as God's art and called poetry back into its service.

It is therefore no surprise that the Roman Church, familiar with the power of the word through the Sacred Scripture and a long tradition of ecclesiastical rhetoric, knew how to instrumentalize the power of the word through poetry for political and religious purposes during the Catholic Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Pope Leo X encouraged the arts and poetry because he realized that, besides censorship being a 'negative' form of control, poetry could be used constructively to enhance the Church's orthodoxy. He employed it as a tool for Catholic propaganda, engaging poets and humanists such as Jacopo Sannazaro and Girolamo Vida to work on ambitious Christian themes.[25]

The poetic production of literature was another means by which Counter-Reformation values could be propagated. Interestingly, a treatise entitled *Pro lingua latina*, dealing extensively with Latin and vernacular literature, was published in 1554 by Gabriele Barrio. According to the little extant information on Barrio's life, he was a member of the Order of the Minims, and most likely became a priest. He had close connections to scholars skilled in theology and humanistic studies at the papal court of Julius III.[26] It is not clear whether or to what extent his work was influenced by the Roman Court. *Pro lingua latina* is of interest for the present study because it defends the primacy of the Latin language over the vernacular, and Latin poetry over the vernacular.

Likewise, *Pro lingua latina* addresses a reform of the educational system and suggests the introduction of strict censorship of vernacular poetry. Barrio's ideas on Latin poetry and the benefit of its study for Christians match to a great

24 Karlheinz Stierle, 'Säkularisierung und Ästhetisierung im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit', in Silvio Vietta and Herbert Uerlings (eds.), *Ästhetik, Religion, Säkularisierung*, i: *Von der Renaissance zur Romantik* (Paderborn: Fink, 2008), 55–74.

25 See Jacopo Sannazaro, *The Major Latin Poems of Jacopo Sannazaro*, trans. Ralph Nash (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996), 8; Carol Kidwell, *Pontano: Poet and Prime Minister* (London: Duckworth, 1991), 149, Reinhold F. Glei, 'Das leere Grab und die Macht der Bilder. Vergil-Rezeption in der *Christias* des Marco Girolamo Vida', in Thorsten Burkhard and Markus Schauer (eds.), *Vestigia Vergiliana: Vergil-Rezeption in der Neuzeit*, second ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 107–20, 109.

26 On Barrio see Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor* in una censura (non più anonima) di Gabriele Barri (ms. Vat. lat. 6149, ff. 142r–150v)', *Critica del testo* VI/1 (2003), 177–220, 177–82.

extent the religious and cultural beliefs of the Fifth Lateran Council. Moreover, *Pro lingua latina* contains judgments on vernacular poets, some of which Barrio elaborated on and submitted to the Roman censorial authorities in the early 1570s. His writing appeared together with two other works, *De aeternitate Urbis* and *De laudibus Italiae*, and the entire volume was accompanied by a papal decree or, more precisely, a *motu proprio* by Julius III in which the pope declares its usefulness for all studies ("ad communem omnium studiorum utilitatem").[27]

The purpose of the volume becomes apparent in *De aeternitate Urbis*, dedicated to Emperor Charles V, one of Europe's most powerful political leaders of the time. Barrio supports the creation of a universal Catholic empire in order to restore the unity of the Catholic Church that had been lost due to the schism between Catholics and Protestants. Consciously or unconsciously, he brings to mind the papal bull *Licet ab initio*, by which the Roman Inquisition was institutionalized in 1542.[28] From Barrio's standpoint, the realization of such goals required means such as poetry which he hoped could shape the future of the Church through the education of young Catholics, a view he shared with Giustinian and Querini.

In defending Latin poetry, Barrio argues that it is written in the language of truth and describes examples of morality and virtue. Similar to Greek, Latin is the language of the liberal arts and other disciplines. Latin and Greek are the languages in which illustrious deeds and words of great men are handed down for posterity.[29] By contrast, the vernacular is severely criticized and repudiated. Among his principal targets are texts by the Three Crowns, Dante Alighieri, Francis Petrarch and Boccaccio, as well as the sixteenth-century poets Jacopo Sannazaro, Ludovico Ariosto and Pietro Bembo.

Barrio's position is important because it has often been argued that the Roman censorial authorities were made aware of the poetry of the Three Crowns through their use by Protestant propagandists in the second half of the sixteenth century. A central role has been ascribed to the Protestant Pier Paolo

---

27 Julius III, *Motu proprio*, Gabriele Barrio, *Pro lingua latina, De aeternitate Urbis liber unus, De laudibus Italiae liber unus* (Rome: Hieronymus de Cartulariis, 1554), n.p. The *motu proprio* is not in the second edition published Rome: In Aedibus Populi Romani, 1571, from which I am quoting (hereafter *PLL*).

28 Cf. Barrio, *De aeternitate Urbis* (1571) 430–2; *PLL*, 'Haec in his libris continentur', [3v], Paul IV, *Licet ab initio*, in *Bullarium Romanum novissimum, ab Leone Magno usque ad S.D.N. Urbanum VIII*, Opus absolutissimum Laertii Cherubini praestantissimi iurisconsulti Romani tertio nunc editum a D. Angelo Maria Cherubino monacho Cassinensi qui ut in altera editione quartum tomum perfecit ita nunc constitutiones S.D.N. Urbani VIII usque hanc diem emanatas addidit (Rome: Ex Typographia Rev. Camerae Apostolicae, 1638), 551s.

29 Cf. Barrio, *PLL* (1554), dedicatory letter to Bishop Antoine Perenot de Granvelle.

Vergerio and his book *Alcuni importanti luochi tradotti fuor delle epistole latine di M. Francesco Petrarca, che fu canonico di Padova, archidiacono di Parma, e laureato in Campidoglio. Con tre sonetti e con XVIII Stanze del Berna che fu secretario di papa Clemente VII. Ove vedessi che opinione hebber ambidue della Romana chiesa* (n.p., 1557). Vergerio used sonnets by Petrarch in which the poet criticizes the Curia in Avignon. This edition appears on the *Index* of 1559.[30] In 1555 Vergerio published Latin letters by Petrarch with an introduction containing Lutheran propaganda, and in the following year Matthias Flacius Illiricus provided a *Catalogus testium veritatis* (Basel, 1556) with passages from Petrarch.[31] Barrio's book could put the idea into question that Roman censorial authorities were made aware of the poetry of the Three Crowns through Protestant propagandists; and there are more factors that should be considered.

Sources from the 1550s contain evidence that the Roman Inquisition proceeded against the works of Petrarch, including his *Canzoniere*.[32] The entire *Canzoniere*, however, was not explicitly prohibited by the *Index*; only the sonnets criticizing the Curia in Avignon had been crossed out in printed editions, and they appeared in the *Index* of 1590 several years after the first *Index* prohibited Vergerio's book: *Francischi Petrarchae il sonetto che incomincia: Dell'empia Babilonia &c.* [*RVF 114*]*, con tre altri appresso, cioè, Fiamma del ciel, &c.* [*RVF 136*]*, Fontana di dolore &c.* [*RVF 138*]*, L'avara Babilonia &c.* [*RVF 137*]. All four are on the *Index* of 1593, but they do not appear on the subsequent *Index* of 1596. The policy of the Roman censorial authorities appears somewhat inconsistent, giving the impression that they endeavored to remain silent about Petrarch. As the prohibition of the Protestants' works includes Petrarch's sonnets against the Curia in Avignon, it might also have served as a means to draw attention away from the poet. This is likewise suggested by the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime* in the 1570s, and a similar strategy might have been employed in Dante's case, as I will discuss below.[33]

I do not wish to refute the idea that the books of Vergerio and Flacius had an effect on the proceedings of the Roman censorial authorities, yet one should be open to taking other factors into account that might also have affected the

30 *Index* of 1559, in *ILI*, viii, 773. Cf. Delio Cantimori, in *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento*, ed. Adriano Prosperi (2nd edn., Turin: Einaudi, 1992), 161, María Luisa Cerrón Puga, 'Censure incrociate fra Italia e Spagna: il caso di Petrarca (1559–1747)', *Critica del testo*, VI/1 (2003), 221–56, 223. For Petrarch see *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, ed. by Adriano Prosperi (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2010), entry 'Petrarca, Franceso'.

31 See Matthias Flacius, *Catalogus testium veritatis, qui ante nostram aetatem Pontefici Romano, eiusque erroribus reclamarunt* ([Basel] Argentinae: Oporinus, 1562), 508.

32 See J.A. Owens and R.G. Agee, 'La stampa della *Musica Nova* di Willaert', *Rivista italiana di musicologia*, 24/2 (1990), 219–305, doc. 39.

33 Cf. below Ch. 3.3 and 6.2.

Roman Church's cultural politics. Barrio's *Pro lingua latina* was published in 1554 and, due to his connections to the Roman court, his ideas and criticisms may well have been known in Roman ecclesiastical circles before Vergerio's publication. It is probable that there were additional reasons for the Roman Church to deal with the poetry of the Three Crowns, one of which might have been that their works had been receiving attention from churchmen since the fourteenth century. We can infer from Barrio's reference to St Antoninus in his censorship of Dante that this issue was familiar to priests engaged in literature, culture and church reform.[34]

Barrio declares that vernacular poetry was written in the tongue of vain and miserable people ("vani et imperiti et caeci et miserabilis vulgi"). He believes to find in it dangerous stories and ugly love along with many other inappropriate and ridiculous things ("perniciosas fabulas et turpes amores aliasque eiusmodi ineptias ludicrasque res"). He identifies "heresies" ("haereses") in Petrarch's lyrics and refers to his poetry as a "lethal illness" ("lethifera tabes").[35] This was a severe accusation.

The works of Dante, Boccaccio, Sannazaro, Ariosto and Bembo serve as further examples of writing that contained errors and severe sins, distortions and derisions of the Catholic faith, not to mention dangerous minglings of the sacred and the profane. Such criticism recalls the Tridentine decree *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* issued only a few years before *Pro lingua latina* was published.

Barrio concluded that poetry is useless to Christian society as there is nothing in profane vernacular poetry concerning science, wisdom or understanding ("scientiam, sapientiam vel prudentiam"). He held that it could spoil good morals, spread barbarian ideas, endanger the orthodoxy of the *simplices*, especially of women and young people, and woo them into immorality. It is small wonder that he adamantly requested the suppression of profane vernacular poetry.[36]

Roughly twenty years after the publication of the first edition of Barrio's volume in the year of the foundation of the Congregation for the *Index* (1571), a second edition was published. It was issued by the Stamperia del Popolo Romano, founded by Pius IV to oppose Protestant writings and it was run by

34 Cf. St Antoninus's comment on *Divina Commedia*, in id., *Chronica, sive opus historiarum* (Basel: Nicolaus Keßler, 1502), part. 3, tit. 21, ch. 5, para. 2.

35 Barrio, *PLL*, 398, 394, 399.

36 Ibid. 392–9, 428.

the nobleman Fabrizio Galletti.[37] Barrio partially elaborated his judgments on the poets Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto and Sannazaro and submitted them in manuscript to Guglielmo Cardinal Sirleto, prefect of the Congregation for the *Index*. One might ask why the *Decameron* was omitted, but it had already been prohibited so may no longer have been of interest to Barrio in the context of censorship. Nonetheless he dealt with it in *Pro lingua latina*.[38]

Poetry and politics combine in *Pro lingua latina*. Barrio's volume was strategically linked to the European political elite. Expressing one's cultural and political thought in a book and making it accessible to a broad audience is one thing, but Barrio tried to anchor his observations and advice on cultural politics where contemporary politics took place. Through the printing privilege granted by the Ciocchi Pope Julius III, his volume was acknowledged by an authority who had not only continued the censorship politics of the Fifth Lateran Council but had also ordered the burning of Hebrew books the preceding year. Before his pontificate, as legate to Pope Paul III, Giovan Maria Ciocchi had been one of the presidents of the Council of Trent. Thus, he was familiar with the cultural topics addressed in Barrio's volume, and was of a similar mind.

In addition, each of the three books of the volume is dedicated to a personality with a key position in the European political and religious hierarchy and censorship politics. *De aeternitate Urbis* is dedicated to Charles V who, as emperor, was also protector of the Catholic Church and furthered censorship in the Holy Roman Empire. *Pro lingua latina* is dedicated to Bishop Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, prime minister to the emperor and later a prominent figure in ecclesiastical and political matters. Under the reign of Charles's son, King Philip II, Granvelle realized the reform of the dioceses in the Netherlands and tightened Counter-Reformation censorship. It is said that he was responsible for the introduction of the Inquisition in the Netherlands.[39] Moreover, Granvelle was a learned man with a deep interest in culture, literature and the arts, especially antiquity, and therefore might have been of interest to Barrio. As early as the 1550s, the focal years of this study, Granvelle had established key relationships with the Roman ecclesiastic elite as well as with an academic circle that dedicated itself to humanist studies of Roman antiquity.

37 See Paul F. Grendler, 'The Adages of Paolo Manuzio: Erasmus and the Roman Censors', in James V. Mehl (ed.), *In laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation Studies for Charles J. Nauert* (Kirksville, Mo.: Thomas Jefferson Univ. Press, 1998), 1–21, 7.

38 On the documents see Appendix, doc. 1.3; on Boccaccio, see Barrio, *PLL*, 421.

39 Cf. Charles Rahlenbeck, *Les subtils moyens par le Cardinal Grandvelle avec ses complices inventez pour instituer l'Inquisition* (Bruxelles: Ch. Muquardt, 1866).

Granvelle encountered representatives of the Roman Inquisition in this academic circle, such as Marcello Cardinal Cervini, later Pope Marcello II, and Rodolfo Pio Cardinal da Carpi, who had presided at the Council of Trent together with Giovan Maria Ciocchi.[40] Barrio's friend Guglielmo Sirleto was in the same circle and shared his passion for the Latin language and literature Barrio may have submitted his censorships of the vernacular poets to him in the 1570s. Sirleto developed a close relationship with Cervini, tutored his nephews, and worked for him in the Vatican Library. During Cervini's presidency of the Council of Trent, Sirleto even provided him with material for central theological and dogmatic discussions.[41] *De laudibus Italiae* addresses Girolamo Cardinal Verallo, who had a close relationship with the pope and was a zealous member of the Roman Inquisition in the 1550s.[42] All these personalities shared Barrio's desire to reform the Roman Church. It can hardly be an accident that Barrio chose them as his dedicatees, that his volume reflects central ideas of Counter-Reformation cultural politics, and that it fits into the political line of Catholic reform already visible in early reform measures of the Fifth Lateran Council and Pope Leo X.

---

40 On Granvelle see Claudia Banz, *Höfisches Mäzenatentum in Brüssel: Kardinal Antoine Perrenoto de Granvelle (1517–1586) und die Erzherzöge Albrecht (1559–1621) und Isabella (1566–1633)* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2000), 66–73.

41 Georg Denzler, *Kardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514–1585). Ein Beitrag zur nachtridentinischen Reform* (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1964), 17–21.

42 Vatican, ACDF, S.O. Decreta 1.

CHAPTER 2

Approaching Censorial Reading

> Sapendo quanto nocumento del Demonio et per mezzo trovato de buoni la lettione de diversi libri scritti per istinto del Demonio et mezzo trovato da lui per seminare zizania nel Campo della Chiesa de Dio . . .
>
> *Editto per ordine della Santa Inquisitione*

2.1 The Virgin Text

"Censorship" ("censura") is more than an "examination", "judgment" or an "authoritarian instrument of communication control."[1] Such definitions focus on a central motive of censorship, and express only a part of the entire phenomenon. Counter-Reformation censorship is to be understood as a complex instrument of the Roman Catholic Church, which had its own complex view of spiritual and intellectual experience. As Vittorio Frajese argues, its censorship was woven into the spiritual ideological concept of the Catholic faith and linked to the theology of sin.[2] While it might sound quite simple, it opens a perspective on censorship that is more extensive than the idea of censorship as an examination and judgment. It helps approach censorship's complex development during the sixteenth century.

Exactly what the *censura* of books implied becomes clearer when one examines the field of canon law. Frajese calls to mind that in medieval canon law, ecclesiastical censure ("censura") was a spiritual punishment to correct Christians. He emphasizes that the same aim of spiritual correction was present in censorship practice. He understood censorship to be an operation derived from canon law where it not only aimed to correct texts but also human consciousness as a form of "spiritual medicine" ("medicina spirituale"). The language of the Roman Catholic Church's official documents justifying censorship suggests that censorship originated in the cult of purity linked to the cult of virginity.[3] In 1543, for instance, the Roman Inquisition explained the

1 See Stephan Fitos, *Zensur als Misserfolg. Die Verbreitung indizierter deutscher Druckschriften in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2000), 1, or Hubert Wolf, *Index. Der Vatikan und die verbotenen Bücher* (Munich: Beck, 2006), 13.

2 Cf. Vittorio Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice. La censura ecclesiastica dal Rinascimento alla Controriforma* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2006), iii, 2, 1.

3 Ibid., esp. 290–1, 274–7.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_003

need to combat heresy for the purpose of maintaining the purity of the faith. A few years later the *Index* was introduced as a means of protecting purity and restoring good morals. Consequently, censorship measures taken to restore the purity of texts were conceived as "purification" ("purgatio", "expurgatio" or "repurgatio"); this reflects the same policy. But what did 'purifying' a text actually mean? The concept implied the restoration of a pure or virginal state and was viewed as the "reform" ("ri-forma") or "restoration" of an original condition ("restauratio originis").[4]

If the Roman Church claimed to "re-form" or "restore" a text to its pure virginal state, the implication was that the Church aimed to give shape to a text that had previously not existed, at least not in written form. How could this concept be explained? The Roman Church provides an answer in *Apostolici regiminis*, where Leo X claims that there is only one truth known to the one Church. All ideas and doctrines deviating from the one truth are considered false distortions.

Augustine's treatise *De civitate Dei* may help to elucidate the idea of the presence of truth in a "pure" text. Augustine sketches a vivid picture of a city of God ("civitas Dei") and an earthly city ("terrena civitas") by drawing upon the opposition of purity and impurity.[5] According to Augustine, the city of God originated in the world of angels, while the earthly city was produced by fallen angels who rebelled against God. The former existed prior to the latter and contains "the good men," whereas the "wicked men" belong to the latter.[6] These two cities sprang from two kinds of love: the earthly city from self-love "to the contempt of God" and the celestial one from divine love "to the contempt of self." Whereas the citizens of God's realm yearn for God, the citizens of the earthly realm are slaves to their desire for power and other earthly vanities.

This concept implies that a citizen of the eternal city creates something through his faith, divine love and enlightenment. His product is thus a product of the eternal city. Likewise, a product created by a citizen of the earthly city is

4 Ibid. 274–8, 280, 282. Cf. *ILI*, viii, 100–6. For examples of the use of the word *repurgatio* see the prohibition of Teofilo Folengo's *Opus macaronicum*, *Index* of 1590, *ILI*, ix, 833: "Nisi ex ratione superiorum regularum repurgatum fuerit." and *Indexes* of 1593 and 1596, in ibid. 893 and 963: "Nisi repurgatum fuerit." By contrast, the remark on the subsequent entry in the *Index* of 1590, works by Marcantonio Flaminio, speaks of "correction": "Quamdiu ex supradicta regularum ratione correcta non fuerint."

5 See Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, trans. Carl Johann Perl (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979), I, xiv, 28.

6 See Johannes van Oort, '*Civitas Dei—terrena civitas*. The Concept of the Two Antithetical Cities and Its Source (Books XI–XIV)', in *Augustinus: De Civitate Dei*, ed. Christoph Horn (Berlin: Akademischer Verlag, 1997), 157–70, 158.

created through self-love to the contempt of God.[7] Augustine holds that man can only find his way out of the earthly city into the city of God through the Catholic faith and purification.[8] He also suggests the existence of a prior state of purity and the possibility of a process of purification.

Attempting to understand this pattern of thought could help clarify the underpinnings of censorship. If a text had been produced by an impure soul in the earthly city it could be impure, whereas a text produced in the celestial city could be as pure and free from sin as a virgin, implying the possibility of a potentially pure counterpart. From this concept emerges the question of whether the chronology of the existence of the two cities also implies a chronological transformation of the elements that constitute an impure text. Such a concept suggests that the impurity of a text is a consequence of the second city, which came into existence after the city of God. It implies a subsequent distortion of faith and divine truth in the second city, and an *im*-purification of ideas or text elements that originally had a pure, virginal state.

This argument might seem far-fetched, but a similar pattern of thought appears in the *Apostolici regiminis*.[9] If false teachings are to be considered distortions of the Roman Catholic truth, then truth, as God's truth, must have preceded all untruths and have been transformed subsequently. So, authors writing impure texts weave together distortions or impure versions of the original truth. This concept clarifies why the Roman Catholic Church presented censorship to the public as a remedy, a spiritual medicine essential to the entire Church. The reason is found in Sacred Scripture, which states that sin divides man from God and may keep man from salvation. St Paul's Letter to the Galatians contains a brief but vivid overview of sins whose depiction in vernacular poetry was repeatedly censored in the sixteenth century as I will show later on:

> Now the works of the flesh are obvious: immorality, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, hatreds, rivalry, jealousy, outbursts of fury, acts of selfishness, dissensions, factions, occasions of envy, drinking bouts, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I warned you before, that those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God. (Gal. 5:19–21)[10]

7 See Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, I, xi, 3.

8 See van Oort, 159.

9 See *Apostolici regiminis*.

10 Quoted after *The New American Bible* <http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0839/_INDEX.HTM>, accessed 31 March 2013. Hereafter all quotations from the Sacred Scripture are taken from this source.

Likewise, the image of poetry's "infected roots" in *Apostolici regiminis* is derived from this concept. It is part of a larger image in which infection and illness suggest a prior state of sanity or health, and impurity is opposed to purity.[11] Such rhetoric brings to mind the widespread metaphors of ecclesiastical rhetoric used by the Church to depict the dangers of heresy as being akin to a deadly disease such as the plague.[12]

Who then was qualified to restore the purity of a text? This could only be someone who understood what pure faith was. According to *Rule* X of the *Index* of 1564, which confirms the Lateran decree *Inter sollicitudines*, books were to be examined prior to printing and publication (pre-censorship) in Rome by the master of the sacred palace and elsewhere by bishops and inquisitors or their delegates. However, *Rule* VIII ordains that utterances regarding heresy, divination, impiety and superstition found in texts with "good" ("bonum") subject matter were to be assessed by theologians appointed by the General Inquisition in Rome.[13] In matters of expurgation, only issues less important than heresy, superstition, divination and impiety could be solved by local authorities. In 1596, the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum* declared that the right to expurgate books fell to bishops and inquisitors, or, where there was no inquisitor, to the bishop. The expurgation was to be carried out by people of a high level of learning ("erudition") and piety ("pietas"). In general, three correctors were to be chosen, but the number could vary according to the nature of the book and the level of learning of the correctors ("considerate genere libri, aut eruditione eorum").[14] Censorship and expurgation were highly responsible tasks of great significance for the Church, in the ideal case resulting in censors considering their work to be of great benefit for the salvation of the Church.

Authors could also be involved in the process of correction, but under strict control. The Roman censorial authorities used various strategies to intervene in the process of poetic creation to compel the author to correct his work. One such strategy was pre-censorship whereby the author could be denied the printing privilege unless he corrected his work. Second, the *Index* was used to intimidate authors and encourage them to self-censor in order to avoid severe

11 Cf. Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*, *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii, 803–8.

12 See Antonio Panella, 'L'introduzione a Firenze dell'Indice di Paolo IV', *Rivista storica degli archivi toscani* 1 (1929), 11–25, 17, Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, 278 and 290.

13 See *Regula* VIII of the *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii.

14 See *Instructio de correctione librorum*, *Index* of 1596, in *ILI*, ix, § 1, 926; cf. ibid. 348; for the *Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri* see Appendix, doc. 2.1, *R* 1.

punishment. Third, a work could be censored after publication and subsequently corrected.

If the author of a printed work that required correction was still alive, he could be asked to correct it himself. Such was the case of Sperone Speroni, Giambattista Marino and Cristoforo Bronzini and Michel de Montaigne. Speroni was asked to correct his *Dialogi* and was interrogated by Paolo Constabile, master of the sacred palace, probably in 1574.[15] However, it was not a common practice of the Congregation for the *Index* or the master of the sacred palace to interrogate poets, as becomes clear when one reviews the files of the Congregation for the *Index*. In Speroni's case, his proximity to Vatican circles may have been a reason for his 'privileged' treatment.[16] In Bronzini's case there is extant correspondence in which he explains and defends his work against his censor's criticism.

The files of the Congregation for the Index show how the task of self-censorship was explained to authors, and how authors were approached and encouraged to self-correct. The files contain Latin and vernacular letters drafted by Cardinal Valier addressing nuncios, bishops, inquisitors, universities and authors. As none of the addressees are identified, the letters might merely be samples. They do not reveal when they were sent or what works they were referring to. One hint, however, is Valier himself, who was a member of the Congregation from 1587 to 1603.

In his letter to the authors, Valier explains that books by deceased authors necessary and useful to Christians were to be purged by censors. By contrast, living authors were to be given the chance to correct their works themselves, according to instructions. Valier suggests that through such correction they would gain praise in the world and merit before God ("… che ne riportarete lode appresso il Mondo, et merito acquistarete apresso Idio dal quale vi desidero ogni contento."). He adds that the Congregation for the Index expected to be sent the corrected print versions with an approbation of the nuncio. He thus reveals indirectly that the addressed authors would be in contact with nuncios, wherefore the authors' whereabouts might be located in the periphery.[17]

---

15 On Speroni's case, see Appendix, doc. 1.1.

16 See *Noctes Vaticanae seu sermones habiti in Academia a S. Carolo Borromeo Romae in Palatio Vaticano instituta. Praemittitur opusculum Augustini Valerii inscriptum Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, ed. Joseph Antonius Saxius (Milan: Typographia Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1748), XX and Valier, *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, in ibid. 16.

17 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. M, 213r and 215r. The file containing the letter was prepared by Paolo Pico, secretary to the Congregation for the Index from 1591 to 1613, and includes

Restoring the Catholic purity or virginity of a text was of course no more than an ideal. Too many cases tell of compromises which were accepted by the censorial authorities for political and cultural reasons, as shall be discussed below. Two crucial questions lay at the heart of the censorship of poetry: how the conception of purity or virginity could be combined with poetic fiction which deviated from the Church's teaching, and why poetic fiction could be considered a danger to readers even if it was only fiction. These were questions which occupied censors as well.

In 1557, the commissar-general of the Roman Inquisition, Michele Ghislieri, made an interesting comment on the censorship of poetry. He found texts such as *Orlando innamorato, Orlando furioso, Orlandino*, and *Decameron* to be sinful, erroneous or even heretical, yet was aware that such texts were read merely as tales and stories ("fabule") and therefore doubted that they should be censored. Nevertheless, if Ghislieri deems the texts sinful, they are infected in some way, as would follow from the Lateran decrees *Apostolici regiminis* and *Inter sollicitudines*. And that is why he deems the censorship of poetry important enough to discuss it with the pope and cardinals:

> Di proibire Orlando [Innamorato and Furioso], Orlandino [by Folengo], cento novelle [Decamerone] et simili altri libri più presto daressemo da ridere ch'altrimente, perché simili libri non si leggono *come* cose a qual si habbi da credere, ma *come* fabule, et *come* si leggono anco molti libri de' gentili *come* Luciano, Lucretio et altri simili. Nondimeno se ne parlerà nella congregatione dei teologi et poi a Sua Santità et alli Reverendissimi . . .[18]

Here, fiction seems to have played an important role in the censorship of poetry. Ghislieri assumed that Christians did not believe that poetic works contained truth because they were known to be fictional. On that ground he was inclined to excuse sinful, erroneous or heretical elements; fiction thereby functioned as a protective characteristic of poetry.

It was nonetheless necessary to discuss the matter with the pope and cardinals, as the protection of Catholic truth through censorship concerned all texts in print and manuscript. Sins were sins, no matter what the form of the text. This is made clear in all Roman *Indexes* and the above-mentioned documents of the Fifth Lateran Council and the Council of Florence, as well as in censorship files. In theory at least, poetic works were controlled, result-

---

documents from these years. Cf. also *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, entry 'Valier, Agostino'.

18 See Ghislieri's letter (27 June 1557), in *ILI*, viii, 32 (my italics), and Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, 77–8.

ing in the Roman Inquisition's discussion of poetic works whilst preparing the first Roman *Index*. The reasons were manifold. Some censors worried about the reception of poetry by readers vulnerable to its untruths. Others suspected authors of using poems as vehicles of heterodox ideas. Nearly all of them recognized the difficulties of assessing complex semantic structures and judging authors of fictional works which contained ideas deviating from the faith. They had to come to terms with this mixture of danger and fiction, and this mixture was understood by some to be pernicious.

2.2 Who is the Author of a Sinful Text?

Ideas of authorship shed light on discussions of the danger of poetry. It is well known that poets had repeatedly been accused of lying since their expulsion from Plato's *Republic*. During the Counter-Reformation movement they were stigmatized as instruments of the devil and his ministers ("demonio et suoi ministri") as illustrated in the *Bibliotheca selecta* by the Jesuit Antonio Possevino.[19] This accusation may have stemmed from the idea that sins and heresies partially originate from Satan's work, but in this case it raises two more questions: to what extent is Satan involved in the creation of a sinful text, and who exactly is the author? These are not issues that censors explicitly dealt with in their judgments on poetry because they concern the fundamentals of censorship practice, but sources on ecclesiastical rhetoric offer a starting point for further investigation. Cardinal Agostino Valier, for example, employed a concept of the devil's influence on man's mind in his treatise on the formation of the ecclesiastical orator, *De rhetorica ecclesiastica ad clericos libri tres*. It was written on commission for his patron Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, and it was edited by Fra Marco Medici, inquisitor of Verona, and published in 1574.

Valier, who later became a zealous and influential member of the Congregation for the Index, declares that in matters of faith one must not believe Satan, his disciples, one's own mind or anyone else:

> Non credendum Sathanae, perenni animarum nostrarum hosti, scelestam dogmatum novitatem suggerenti, non credendum eius discipulis haereticis, puritatem catholicae fidei malitiose, et impie contaminantibus:

19 See Antonio Possevino, *Bibliotheca selecta, qua agitur de ratione studiorum in historia, in disciplinis, in salute omnium procurando* (Rome: Domenico Basa, Stamperia Vaticana, 1593), i, 42–4.

> non credendum proprio ingenio: neque cuivis in rebus ad fidem pertinentibus.[20]

This statement suggests that Valier was not using Satan figuratively to symbolize man's inner life and sinfulness; rather, Satan was considered to be an authentic being powerful enough to manipulate man. Such a belief can likewise be found in official and unofficial documents written by the censorial authorities, which state that Satan was involved in the process of text creation. This stance offers insight into the complexity of authorship.

In official documents written by popes, councils and the Roman Inquisition, Satan was repeatedly presented as the driving force behind man's sinfulness. In the decree *Apostolici regiminis* he is referred to as the "sower of cockle" ("zizaniae seminator"), the originator of sin and heresy, and the "ancient enemy of mankind" ("antiquus humani generis hostis") whose goal it is to lead man away from God.[21] Pope Innocent VIII, in his *Summis desiderantes affectibus*, acknowledges the existence of witches and, in his inauguration of the persecution of witchcraft, he commissions two Inquisitors, Heinrich Institor and Jakob Sprenger, to proceed against men and women who cooperate with the devil.[22] In his constitution *Licet ab initio* of 1542, with which he reformed the Inquisition, Paul III declares that Christians could be seduced by

---

20 See Valier, *De rhetorica ecclesiastica ad clericos libri tres* (Venice: Andrea Bocchini, et fratres, 1574), I, 6, cf. I, 16.

21 See *Apostolici regiminis*, 605, cf. *Inter sollicitudines*.

22 As modern critics have questioned the interpretation of this bull, according to which the pope commissioned the two inquisitors to persecute witchcraft, I would like to point to an interpretation by Francisco Peña as confirmation. Peña published Eymerich's inquisitorial manual *Directorium inquisitorum* with a commentary. This volume also contains a rich collection of documents on the inquisition collated on behalf of the Roman Inquisition. Among them he includes the bull of Innocent VIII and his comment shows that he understood the bull to be against a sect practicing witchcraft and thus provided it with the heading: "Tribuitur potestas inquisitoribus procedendi contra haeresim sive sectam maleficorum." Cf. Peña (ed.), *Litterae Apostolicae diversorum summorum Pontificum pro Officio Sanctissima Inquisitionis*, in Eymerich, *Directorium inquisitorum*, cum commentariis Francisci Pegne sacrae theologiae ac iuris utriusque doctoris, ad S.D.N. Gregorium XIII. Pont. Max. (Venice: Marcantonio Zaltieri, 1607), 83, cf. Peña's commentary, id., *Annotationes in Tractatum de strigis Bernardi Comensis*, in Bernardo of Como, *Lucerna inquisitorum haereticae pravitatis R.P.F. Bernardi Comensis Ordinis Praedicatorum et eiusdem tractatus De strigibus*, cum annotationibus Francisci Pegnae sacrae theologiae et iuris utriusque doctoris (Rome: Bartolomeo Grassi, 1584), 155–9, 156. On Peña, see *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, entry 'Peña, Francisco'.

"diabolic fraud" ("diabolica fraude seducti").[23] Sixtus V, in his bull *Coeli et terrae creator Deus*, refers to Satan as the "author" ("auctor") of divinations invented solely for the purpose of deceiving man.[24] The concept of Satan as "author" of the divinatory arts can also be found in Origen's comment on the book of Job: "Diabolus est author divinationis, et naturae subtilitate et agilitate nonnumquam future revelat." Origen is quoted by Bishop Diego Simancas in his *De Catholicis institutionibus*, an acknowledged reference book frequently cited in inquisitorial manuals.[25]

As the author of heresy, the devil was explicitly blamed for creating harmful texts and using them as his instrument. Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, bishop of Bologna, had strong connections to the Roman Inquisition and became a member of the Congregation for the Index in 1582.[26] In 1573 he published an edict of the Inquisition of Bologna which, although reminiscent of the depiction of Satan in *Apostolici regiminis*, was closer to Possevino. The edict refers to books written with the "devil's impulse" and used by Satan to sow cockle in the Catholic Church: "Sapendo quanto nocumento del Demonio et per mezzo trovato de buoni la lettione de diversi libri scritti per istinto del Demonio et mezzo trovato da lui per seminare zizania nel Campo della Chiesa de Dio . . ."[27]

Approximately ten years later in 1582, Paleotti employed similar rhetoric in his treatise on sacred and profane images, a product of his work at the Council of Trent. The title announces the objective of revealing forms of abuse in the arts, and the second edition, written in Latin, states that it follows the decrees

23 Paul IV, *Licet ab initio*.

24 Cf. Sixtus V, quoted in Gregory of Naples, *Enchiridion Ecclesiasticum, sive praeparatio pertinens ad Sacramentum Poenitentiae & sacri Ordinis*, editum a Gregorio Cappucino Neapol. uno ex Deputatis Patribus pro Revisione Librorum in Civitate Neapoli. Per Illustrissimum et Reverendissimum Arciepiscopum (Venice: Girolamo Polo, 1588), 164r.

25 Cf. Diego Simancas, *De Catholicis institutionibus liber, ad praecavendas et extirpandas haereses admodum necessarius* (Rome: In aedibus Populi Romani, 1575), 144. Cf. "Igitur dubitari non potest, quin daemones sint authores divinationum: quod et Plato non ignoranti, ut fatetur in Convivio, vaticinia, incantationes, divinationes & magiam, per daemones hominibus concedi, atque idipsum Apuleius confirmat, libro de Deo Socratis."

26 Paleotti studied canon and civil law, lectured in civil law, was auditor of the Rota Romana, participated as a canon lawyer in the last session of the Council of Trent when censorship and the Roman *Index* were discussed, and was a member of the commission reforming the Paulinian *Index*. See *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, entry 'Paleotti, Gabriele'.

27 See *Editto per ordine della Santa Inquisitione* of 20 July 1573, in *Episcopale Bononensis Civitatis, et Diocesis*, raccolta di varie cose che in diversi tempi sono state ordinate da Monsignor Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Cardinale Paleotti, Vescovo di Bologna (Bologna: Alessandro Benacci, con licenza de' Superiori, 1580), 23v–24r.

of the Council of Trent. Paleotti dedicates an entire chapter to the devil's abuse of the arts. The devil, he explains, operates through painters and sculptors. A painter commissioned to paint Christ, for instance, might represent him as Apollo, and a sculptor might create a metamorphosis and tale instead of a statue for martyrs.[28] The devil's work is referred to as a "craft" ("ars"), an idea derived from the Benedictine theologian Rupert of Deutz:

> Ita Doctor quidam gravis solebat dicere: Daemonis hanc esse artem; ut cum, tanquam leo, vincere non possit, serpentem aut draconem induat; hoc est, cum roboris in illo tantum non est, ut vincere aperte possit; ad insidias convolat; et cum arma auferre non valet, illa aut, ut dictum est, retundat, aut in nos ipsos retorqueat. Vellet Diabolus, ut fame tabesceremus; cum id non potest, venena spargit; et cum imagines nequit de medio removere; tot abusis invehit et imponit, ut iam damnum vel maximum, nisi provisum et cautum probe est, afferre debeant.[29]

By almost juxtaposing God and the devil, Paleotti maintains that the arts are gifts from God ("quod a Deo accepit"), and as such should not be used to serve the Devil ("Diaboli ministerio").[30] Paleotti's concept indirectly confirms Possevino's idea of poets as the devil's ministers. Such a portrayal of the devil and his influence may at first glance be understood in the figurative sense, but one should remember that, besides man, there are two other operating forces mentioned in these texts: Satan and God. It makes little sense to interpret one force figuratively and allegorically yet the other not.

The concept of the devil as a being is clear in sixteenth-century theoretical writings on witchcraft and demonology. Girolamo Menghi, a member of the Order of Friars Minor, was an assiduous writer in this field and an expert on exorcism. Menghi authored *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica* (1576), *Flagellum daemonum* (Bologna, 1576, and dedicated to Paleotti), and *Fustis daemonum* (1584). Menghi corroborates his vision of the devil, among other things, with decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council and the First Council of Braga. He emphasizes that Satan and the demons were indeed created

28 See Gabriele Paleotti, *De imaginibus sacris et profanis, libri quinque, quibus multiplices earum abusus iuxta sacrosancti Concili Tridentini decreta deteguntur* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1594), 142.

29 Ibid. 143.

30 Ibid. 221.

beings.[31] Menghi even addresses the question of which languages demons speak. He maintains that they do not or seldom speak Latin, Hebrew or Greek because it is not conceded by God.[32] This opens a fruitful perspective with regard to the Counter-Reformation polemic against "infected vernacular poetry."

The existence of the devil is also confirmed in *De strigis* by Inquisitor Bernardo of Como, a member of the Order of Preachers. Similar to Menghi's work, *De strigis* is linked to the Roman censorial authorities. Francisco Peña was a Spanish canonist and doctor of theology with close connections to the Roman court. He discovered the text in the archives of the Roman Inquisition and published it with a commentary three years before he began his work as *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index in 1587.[33]

Sacred Scripture offers little material on Satan. He appears in the Book of Job, in which he tests Job's faith with God's consent. As James explains, man has a dual nature and is tempted by his own desire: "Rather, each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire. Then desire conceives and brings forth sin, and when sin reaches maturity it gives birth to death." (James 1:14–15). James states that man has two minds: "Draw near to God, and he will draw near to you. Cleanse your hands, you sinners, and purify your hearts, you of two minds." (James 4:8). He further advises Christians to resist the devil's temptations by seeking protection in God: "So submit yourselves to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." (James 4:7) Thus, James indirectly acknowledges Satan's influence, the existence of a force beyond the person being influenced. Satan conceives the sin before man does, and, due to his dual nature, man is vulnerable to Satan's work.

From the Gospel of John we learn that Satan influences man by entering his mind as he is said to have entered Judas's mind by making him betray Christ (John 13:2, 27). In John we also find that

> whoever sins belongs to the devil, because the devil has sinned from the beginning. Indeed, the Son of God was revealed to destroy the works of

31 Cf. Girolamo Menghi, *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica et possibilità delle mirabili et stupende operationi delli demoni et de' Malefici*, con li rimedi opportuni alle infermità Maleficiali (Venice: Pietro Bertano, 1605), 21.

32 Ibid. 310 and id., *Flagellum daemonum exorcismos terribiles, potentissimos et efficaces*, remedia probatissima ac doctrinam singularem in malignos spiritus expellendos, facturasque et maleficia fuganda de obsessis corporis complectens. Accessit postremo Pars secunda, quae *Fustis Daemonum* inscribitur (Bologna: Giovanni Rossi, 1584), 4–5 and 46.

33 On Peña see *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, 'Peña, Francisco', and Peña, in Bernardo of Como.

> the devil. No one who is begotten by God commits sin, because God's seed remains in him; he cannot sin because he is begotten by God. (1 John 3:8–9)

It may be for this reason that Paul recommends that man use faith to protect himself against Satan's attacks, comparing the Catholic faith to a shield. Man has the power to take action and decide against sin (Eph. 6:16).[34]

The driving force behind man's action is believed to be Satan, who abuses man's predisposition to sin. By entering man's mind and influencing it, Satan creates or plants the seeds of a sinful idea; in other words, he authors a sinful idea and uses man as a conduit operating as a 'co-author' of a sinful book.

The very first *auctor* of the universe is believed to have been God the Creator, or *Deus poeta*.[35] The Sacred Scripture was authored by him or, more precisely, by the Holy Ghost, and put to paper by human scribes. St Gregory, in his study of the Book of Job, explains that the authorship model of the Sacred Scripture encompasses a divine "author" ("auctor") and a human writer, likened and reduced to "the pen" of "a great man" and "inspired" by the Holy Ghost. Alastair Minnis shows that this model was widespread; Gregory of Auxerre, for example, argues in his *Expositio in cantica canticorum* that what counts is not who wrote the *Cantica* but what is meant by it.[36]

The diffusion of the author concept of the Sacred Scripture is provided in Scripture itself (Hebrews 1:1–2, Ps. 2:28–29, 95:1–3, Jes. 2:1–4, Jer. 3:17).[37] It seems compatible with the concept of sinful texts created under the influence of the devil if one permits the idea that Satan plays a creative role and operates as a part of divine creation. From this perspective, it becomes clear how Catholics came to accuse poets of being Satan's instruments and why the Roman Church made use of this rhetoric to justify its radical control and suppression measures, even though there is only a small number of supporting canonical sources.

---

34 Cf. *The New American Bible*.

35 For God as *poietes*, see Oswald Bayer, *Gott als Autor. Zu einer poietologischen Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 2–3, Alastair J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (2nd edn., Aldershot: Wildwood House, 1988), 36–9 and ch. 3; Albert Russell Ascoli, *Dante and the Making of a Modern Author* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 7–8.

36 See Minnis, 37–8, cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, I, xi, 3.

37 Still in the twentieth century the Roman Church formulates this idea, see Second Vatican Council, *Dogmatische Konstitution Dei Verbum über die göttliche Offenbarung*, iv, 14 <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html>, accessed 31 March 2013.

2.3 The Author in Censorship Practice

"Author" (Latin: *author* or *auctor*) is a word frequently used in censorship. The manner in which it is used tells a lot about the mechanism of the *Index* and censorship practice. It also brings us closer to the authors of the Roman Inquisition's *Index*.

The French *Catalogue des livres censurez*, published by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris in 1544, employs the word to structure the list of authors and titles. It is divided into sections entitled "catalogues". The first catalogue alphabetically lists books according to their authors' surnames: "Catalogus librorum qui hactenus a facultate Theologiae Parisiensi diligenter examinati, censuraque digni visi sunt, ob causas in calce superioris epistolae fusius declaratas: secundum ordinem alphabeticum, iuxta authorum cognomina." The second catalogue contains books by authors whose names were unknown or uncertain: "Catalogus librorum quorum incerti sunt authores." The same form of classification was applied to the third and fourth catalogues of French vernacular books listed by the authors' surnames: "Catalogus librorum gallicorum, Ex certis authoribus iuxta illorum cognomina" and "Catalogus librorum gallicorum ab incertis authoribus." The last section is dedicated to "Censura librorum sequentium et similium."[38]

The *Index* of 1559 by the Roman Inquisition uses a structure similar to that of the French *Catalogue*. Since the *Catalogue* had been printed in Rome in 1549 by Antonio Blado, it is feasible that it served as a model for the Roman Inquisition. The first section lists authors whose books and other works were prohibited, written or published under their actual names or the names or surnames of their followers: "Auctores quorum libri et scripta omnia, et quaecunque sub eorum, vel sub sequacium ipsorum nomine, vel cognomine conscripta aut edita sunt, vel in posterum conscribentur, sive edentur." The prohibition also applied to their works written and published in subsequent years, even if they contained nothing in regard to or against the faith. The next section lists prohibited books by authors whose names were known to the Inquisition: "Certorum auctorum libri prohibiti", and the third section is dedicated to books by authors whose names were unknown: "Libri prohibiti ab incerti nominis auctoribus compositi."[39]

The same structure underlies the *Index* of 1564, in which the sections are referred to as "classes" ("classes"). The first class lists authors deemed heretics

38 See *Catalogue des livres censurez* of 1544, in *ILI*, i.

39 See *Index* of 1559, in *ILI*, viii.

or suspects of heresy ("Auctores primae classis"). The second class deals with prohibited books by authors whose names were known to the censorial authorities ("Certorum auctorum libri prohibiti") and the third class comprises prohibited books by anonymous authors ("Libri prohibiti, ab incerti nominis auctoribus compositi"). The *Praefatio* to the *Index* explains that the second class includes books prohibited due to their heterodox or suspect doctrine or the potential offense in matters of morality that they could bring to Christians even if their authors had never left the Church. The third class contains anonymous books, the doctrines of which contravene Catholic faith and morals and were therefore rejected by the Roman Church.[40]

It may seem that the authors' names were used merely as an organizational tool to list books. At the beginning of the century, the pre-censorship decree by Leo X identified texts by their content and the language in which they were written. There was no mention of their authors, and no difference was made between poetic or scientific texts. Likewise, the *Index* concerns prohibited books as is clearly suggested by its title, and the promulgation bull declares that the *Index* served to inform Christians of what books and other forms of writing they should not read.[41]

A development in censorship is evident in the 1550s and 1560s, demonstrating increased awareness by censorial authorities that texts should be read and assessed in their own right. Produced under the pontificate of Paul IV, the *Index* of 1559 expresses a general prohibition of many works that had been published anonymously in the preceding forty years with nothing to identify the name of the printer or the date or place of publication. However, an instruction in the *Index*, *Instructio circa Indicem librorum prohibitorum ad omnes inquisitores et ministros Sacri Officii Sanctae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis*, specifies that such texts could be allowed if they had previously been examined and approved and if no fraud was found behind the anonymity. The *Index* of 1564 explicitly declares that anonymous texts might be worth reading and studying.[42] Thus, it was not the name of the author or authority that determined whether a text should be read, but the value of the text itself. This development can be further traced in the same *Index* that contains the promulgation bull *Dominici gregis custodiae* by Pope Pius IV. The Pope makes it clear that the *Index* was

40 See *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii, 811.

41 See Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*, in *ILI*, viii, 803–4.

42 See *Index* of 1559, in ibid. 774, 102 and Fra Francisco Forerio (O.P.), *Praefatio in Indicem librorum prohibitorum, confectum a Deputatione Tridentinae Synodi*, in *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii, 811.

to be understood as a control instrument for books.[43] This is not to say that exceptions could not be made in particular cases.

Yet the *Index* offers evidence that the authors' names did not only serve as structural tools. To begin with, the French *Catalogue* uses the word "author" while the Roman *Index* prefers "auctor." Is this difference a coincidence? Scholars of the Renaissance have shown that since the late Middle Ages, due to humanist thought, the notion of the *auctor* and traditional authorship developed towards a modern concept of authorship in the Renaissance.[44] Examining medieval ideas on authorship, however, may take us further. As Alastair Minnis shows, medieval grammarians held that the meaning of *auctor* was rooted in four main sources. The first three were Latin verbs: *agere* ("to act or perform") because the *auctor* is considered to perform the act of writing, *augere* ("to grow") because the *auctor* brings something into being and causes it to grow and *avieo* ("to tie") because poets tie together words "with feet and metre."[45] The fourth semantic aspect is particularly interesting in the interpretation of blacklists. According to Dante, the word *auctor* was believed to derive from the Greek noun *autentim* (cf. Greek: *authentes*), which Latin grammarians translated as "authority."[46] From this root sprang the idea that authors' writings hold authority; in *Convivio*, for instance, Dante explains that an author's text must be "worthy of faith and obedience" ("degno di fede e di obbedienza").[47]

The distinction between *auctor* and *autor* opens another perspective. Hugutio of Pisa distinguishes between *auctor* with a '*c*' and *autor* without a '*c*' whereby the former means "augmentator" and the latter connotes "autoritas."[48] This could explain the linguistic difference between the French and Roman blacklists, both of which were written in Latin. As is plain from several files of the Roman Inquisition and Congregation for the Index, the language and formulation of legal texts was an important aspect that was intensely discussed and

43 See Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*.

44 See Ascoli, 23.

45 Minnis, 10 and 13.

46 Cf. Earl Jeffrey Richards, 'Christine de Pizan and the Freedom of Medieval French Lyric: Authority, Experience, and Women in the Republic of Letters', in *Christine de Pizan and Medieval French Lyric*, ed. id. (Gainsville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1998), 22 at n. 14. Cf. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

47 See Dante, *Convivio*, ed. F. Brambilla Ageno (Florence: Casa Ed. Le Lettere, 1995), 2: testo, IV, vi, 1–5. See A.R. Ascoli, 4; Michelangelo Picone, ' "Per Ovidio parla d'amore . . ." Dante "auctor" della *Vita nova*', in *Studi in onore di Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo per i suoi settant'anni*, ed. allievi padovani (Tavarnuzze, Florence: SISMEL, 2007), i, 237–52, 238s.

48 Cf. Minnis, 219 at n. 6.

thoroughly thought through. It is indeed possible that the Roman Inquisition, in preparing the first Roman *Index*, sought to render its language as precise as possible and therefore chose the word "auctor" instead of "author" because of its meaning. For the same reason, Sixtus V may have chosen to call Satan an "auctor" in his bull *Coeli et terrae creator Deus* in order to express Satan's role and work as "the sower of cockle."

The blacklists were supposed to encompass authors to whom the Roman Church denied authority, which could be why the Roman Inquisition decided not to follow the example of the French *Catalogue* by using the word "author." Instead, the Inquisition used the word "auctor." From the linguistic standpoint of the time, their lists only referred to individuals who brought texts into being; it could not have been otherwise. It would have been a rather strange coincidence if their decision had not been based on philological knowledge present among those who prepared the Roman *Index*.

How authors' names might have been used in censorship practice emerges from the *Index*. In censorial documents, the author's name usually referred to a historical person. Censors often, though not always, judged the historical person on the grounds of his texts, but the *Index* suggests another type of function of the author's name. It is noteworthy that, unlike the second and third classes of the *Index*, the first class does not list prohibited books but authors who were considered heretics or suspects of heresy. The *Index* of 1564 states that everyone must understand that their writings are prohibited. Condemnation of the author was equivalent to the condemnation of his work as long as no further precisions were made.[49]

Use of the authors' names implies that the names served to determine prohibited texts. They functioned as a category, and as such could be applied as a means by which authors "of the same kind" ("eiusdem generis") could be censored.[50] Such authors were believed to share the same or similar convictions which had led to the condemnation of the authors already listed. They were thus also considered suspects of heresy, if not heretical. By using the name of one author, the censorial authorities could, indirectly and simultaneously, indicate and prohibit an indefinite group of other authors without knowing their names or works. The name of each author was therefore used as an instrument and fulfilled a function. This principle had already been explicitly formulated in the *Index* of 1557. The heading of the first section of prohibited

49 See Forerio, *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii, 810. However, certain works by heretics could be expurgated, cf. *Regula* VIII, in ibid., 817.

50 Ibid. 811.

authors declares that all writings by the followers of the listed heretics were likewise prohibited through the names of their leaders.

When one considers the function of the author's name, Michel Foucault's concept of the author as function or "author-function" comes to mind. Even though there are differences between the "function" or role of the author's name in the sixteenth-century *Index* and the "author-function" in twentieth-century Foucault, there is an aspect of Foucault's concept which opens an interesting perspective on the way in which censors dealt with the early modern author concept.

Foucault explains that the author's name is a proper name; it does not only serve "an indicative function." It is "the equivalent of a description." The author's name has a role in regard to discourse, "a classificatory function" so that texts can be grouped together, defined and contrasted to others, and an author's name that labels a discourse that is not of "ordinary everyday speech" receives a certain status in the given culture.[51]

Censors, or the authors of the *Index*, did not think in terms of "discourse," but a similar pattern of thought comes to light in censorship practice. If the author's name was used to identify similar books not listed in the *Index*, the mechanism was based on the analogy between the product of the listed author and that of others not listed. This implies that if the listed author was prohibited because of his heretically classified teachings, then the author's name was further used for labelling, and became a tool of censorship. As a consequence, his works were received, or should have been received, in a particular way in Catholic society, granting him, as well as his teachings, a particular status in Catholic society.

A vivid example is the so-called *heresiarch*, an author of a heresy or leader of a heretical sect. The teachings of a *heresiarch* could produce a heretical movement, influence other authors, and live on in their works. For this reason the *Index* of 1590 includes the section *Catalogus Haeresiarcharum, Haeresum auctorum, eorumque qui eas suscitarunt, seu Haereticorum duces, aut capita extiterunt, qui ad faciliorem intelligentiam quartae regulae huius indicis apponitur*.[52] There is an interesting remark by Gabriele Barrio on Petrarch's love lyrics which does not describe the *heresiarch* but demonstrates that it was possible to observe a similar pattern in the influence of a poet's work on its readers. Barrio, who accused Petrarch of several severe sins on the grounds of his love lyrics, did not overlook his immense effect on other poets, his imitators

51 See Michel Foucault, 'Was ist ein Autor?', in *Texte zur Theorie der Autorschaft*, ed. Fotis Jannidis, Gerhard Lauer, Matias Martinez, Simone Winko (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2007), 210.

52 *ILI*, ix, 848–9.

and followers ("asseclae") and tried to warn others, thus employing the common metaphor of "lethal illness" ("lethifera tabes") in order to describe both it and the implied danger.[53] What Barrio refers to is Petrarchism, or certain forms of it, a particular language and style that went hand in hand with certain ideas, as I shall demonstrate below.

I would not go so far as to equate the Foucauldian "author-function" with the concept underlying the mechanism of the *Index*, but it helps to elucidate the latter. To differentiate, I refer to the mechanism of the *Index* as the 'author principle' (or Latin: '*auctor* principle'). Certainly in censorship, as initially stated, the Latin term *auctor* was not limited to authors of a certain status in Catholic society but applied to anyone who composed a text. It is important to note that censors were aware that a difference could exist between what an author wrote in a text and what he actually believed. This is not far from the modern distinction between the author and the historical person. Judgments could be made about the historical person on the grounds of his text, yet could subsequently be revised after hearing the writer's explanation of the text. Therefore the author principle, as apparent in the *Index*, was an instrument, used but not labelled as such, which allowed a preliminary judgment of an author based on an interpretation of the assessed work and image of him. As scholars of the Renaissance have shown, the medieval *auctor* concept developed further. Between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries the development brought about a new idea about authors and the awareness that being an author involved expressing subjective views.[54] Counter-Reformation control of writing and the mind may have increased this awareness and made it more complex. At the same time, it influenced and restricted evolving individuality and subjectivity.

2.4 Tracing the Imagined Reader

The role of the reader shines through in various aspects of Counter-Reformation censorship. It was a basic element of the censorship mechanism, or system. In his promulgation bull of the *Index*, Pius IV explains to the Catholic readership that one purpose of the *Index* is to protect their souls and salvation by teaching them what texts were not to be read.[55] The Catholic reader, as the percipient of potentially perilous books, is presented as being in need of instruction and

53 Barrio, *PLL*, 399 and 409.

54 See Ascoli, 30–1.

55 See Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*.

protection. This further brings into play the demand for the utility of texts for readers.[56] Some sources show that censorship was not only meant to protect the reader from perilous texts; since printing was meant to serve the Church and be used to the glory of God, texts were meant to be useful to their readers. This was a vision with radical implications. Nonetheless, the ideas on the utility of texts and the purpose of the reader's protection help trace the figure of the reader in censorship to better understand the methods and aims of control and manipulation.

To start with, a text's utility was a crucial keyword and criterion in censorship. This was not new because it had already been known to medieval scholasticism. As Minnis has shown, it had to be made plain how a text could be useful and of benefit to Christian education.[57] Counter-Reformation censorship transgressed the boundaries of the academic world, demanding the utility of any published text for the Catholic reader and for all fields of Catholic life. Vincenzo Bonardo, secretary to the Congregation for the Index, submitted a discourse on the reform of the *Index* in manuscript to the Congregation in 1587, in which he briefly outlined the significance of the utility ("utilitas") of a text. Bonardo argued that a book by a Catholic author could be prohibited if it was of little or no utility because the doctrine could be learned from another, perhaps more competent author. The same principle should apply to texts containing errors or in which an author presented his conceits ("concetti") in an obscure or fastidious manner so as to cause damage or give occasion to err.

Bonardo emphasized that a large number of books such as *romanzi, canzoni*, stories, *capitoli* and orations, spiritual books and re-enactments of biblical stories full of errors and heresies were in the hands of unlearned people ("persone Idiote et Semplici"). He linked a text's utility to the positive effect of censorship on the book market, which profited consumers. Writers and printers would profit from censorship, as they would be more alert in their future work, and scholars would profit financially and intellectually by buying and studying fewer but better books.[58]

Bonardo imagined the Catholic readership to be heterogeneous, and pictured potential readers. He understood that by perceiving a text, a reader digested it. For Bonardo, reading was an active process. This pattern of thought

56 On the *utility* of censorship see e.g. Forerio, 809–12; on public utility (*publica utilitas*) of censorship see *Instructio eorum, qui libris tum prohibendis, tum expurgandis, tum etiam imprimendis, diligentem ac fidelem* (*ut par est*) *operam sunt daturi, Index* of 1596, in *ILI*, ix, 924.

57 See Minnis, 23.

58 See Appendix, doc. 2.2.

influenced his vision of suitable books and, consequently, book censorship. His vision recalls the modern theory of the implied reader, the reader addressed by a text.

Censorship was influenced by the conjured figure of an imaginary reader. A text was cleansed in order to be suitable and useful for the imagined reader. This approach brings to mind modern theories of the implied reader introduced by Wayne C. Booth and further developed by others. In assessing a text and creating a purer version suitable for an imagined reader, censors had to create such a figure, who was always Catholic. This does not necessarily imply that censors consciously dealt with a figure of writing; they may simply have imagined how a potential reader might read the text in their consideration of possible difficulties and dangers. The following material may elucidate this idea.

Bonardo's position was quite close to that of Agostino Cardinal Valier's. Valier, viewed in censorship through his roles as a bishop and member of the Congregation for the Index, outlined his thoughts on printing, writing and the publication of books in *De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris* (1589–1604) only two years after Bonardo finished his *Discorso*. Significantly, this work was dedicated to Silvio Cardinal Antoniano, who had been *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index since 1587 and had become a member of the Congregation after his appointment as cardinal.[59] Like the above *De rhetorica ecclesiastica ad clericos libri tres*, this book was closely linked to and placed at the heart of the Roman censorial authorities. It is interesting to see that Valier produced several works on writing and composition. Aside from *De rhetorica ecclesiastica* he authored *Adversus barbariem in scribendo* (*Contra Arabes et Scholasticos philosophos*) and *De conscribenda historia*. His books had purpose; in addition to censorship, he felt that influencing the processes of writing, editing and publishing was another means of controlling the book market, which recalls Barrio's publications of 1554.

Valier draws a clear line between private writing as an intellectual exercise and publication as an act of sharing one's ideas with the public readership. He declares that every writer must remember that a perfect life and solid praise are attained not simply through writing but by writing adequately.[60] Writing, he states, is another way of speaking in a considerate manner ("scribere est considerate loqui"). When publishing, writers ought to consider what is being

59 See *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, entry 'Antoniano, Silvio'.

60 See Agostino Valier, *De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris*, in Giovanni Cipriani, *La mente di un inquisitore. Agostino Valier e l'Opusculum De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris* (*1589–1604*) (Florence: Nicomp Laboratorio Editoriale, 2008), ch. LX.

said how to whom and why. Those who dare to teach others should write not only for contemporary readers but also for posterity. Books that corrupt good morals, that are read by poor readers ("deteriores lectores") and nourish only the reader's lust ("voluptas") should not be printed. Sharing Bonardo's opinion, he states that writing should be useful, serving Catholic society and "common utility" ("communem . . . utilitatem").[61]

Among Valier's examples of "useful writing" ("utiliter scribere") and publishing ("utiliter edere") are Cesare Baronio's *Annales*, which instruct the "Christian Republic", and Robert Bellarmine's works against the Protestants. Both these authors were censors in service to the Roman censorial authorities. Valier insists that Catholics study only for the purpose of becoming better Catholics, and write only for the purpose of increasing the faith of the Church. In his view, ideal authors were saints who taught humility, the soul's strength, constancy, chastity, love, and many excellent virtues by examples of martyrdom.[62]

In discussing the utility of texts, Bonardo and Valier take into account their potential readership. The reader is always Catholic, but Bonardo considers both a learned and an unlearned reader. The former is a scholar and reads in order to be instructed, while the latter is in danger because, due to his insufficient education, he is unable to recognize errors and heresies. By contrast, Valier reminds us of a "worse" reader who would read to satisfy his desire. Thus, both censors consider different types of readers with different interests in books and different reading competencies. Their observations suggest the awareness of the heterogeneous readership of the time and the fact that books could have different effects on different readers.

In addition, they present further censorship questions: How is profane vernacular poetry perceived by a heterogeneous readership? How could the censorial authorities prepare a text suitable for everyone? When Ghislieri argues that texts such as the *Decamerone* and *Orlando* stories are read like tales but not in the same way as texts in which one is required to believe, he employs a comparison of texts in order to explain how poetic texts are read. He suggests that poetic texts possess no authority, unlike Sacred Scripture; readers do not believe in them. In so doing, Ghislieri also imagines a readership and draws a picture of potential readers and their ways of dealing with poetry. He acknowledges dangers inherent in texts, which reveals his expectation that certain readers could be affected by them although these texts are tales and should be read as such. Similar thoughts and doubts can be traced in various censorial judgments on profane vernacular poetry. Censors tried to anticipate

61 See Valier, *De cautione adhibenda*, 245, 248, 201, 249–50.

62 Ibid. 262, Cipriani, 151; on Valier's treatise see also Peter Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 70ss.

what readers would make of the texts and the ideas expressed therein. Censors acknowledged that texts evolved and lived on in the readers' minds.[63] Ideally, censors were experienced readers themselves in order to better anticipate potential reader behavior.

The awareness of the reader became particularly important in inquisitorial practice, where it seems to have been refined during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In his inquisitorial manual, Inquisitor Desiderio Scaglia, who was a member of the Order of Preachers and appointed *commissario* of the Roman Inquisition under the pontificate of Pope Paul V, explains how to proceed against possessors of prohibited books ("detentori de' libri prohibiti"). The first thing to do is to follow the normal procedure, the usual examination of the books ("la solita perquisitione"). Secondly, one must determine the quality of the person ("la qualità delle persone"), the quality of the book ("la qualità de' libri") and the period of possession ("diuturnità della retentione"). The entire issue depends on the quality of the people and books as well as the prudence of the judge,[64] and here the possessor of the prohibited book enters the scene as the reader.

Similar to Bonardo and Valier, Scaglia distinguishes readers by education and intelligence. He describes the intelligent reader ("persona indicata intelligente"), the ignorant and simple reader who cannot recognize dangerous contents ("persone ignoranti e semplici massime delle notitie che detti libri trattano") and the completely uneducated person who cannot read properly or understand what they are reading ("in tutto ignoranti, né sapessero leggere, né intendere quello che leggono . . ."). [65] Scaglia believed that reading could influence readers. He explains that reading can "cause a bad effect in these people" and "generate doubts about matters of the faith." It was the inquisitor's task to determine the effect in every single case:

> Se poi le persone che hanno ritenuto detti libri sono ignoranti, e semplici massime delle notitie che detti libri trattano, e nel constitutirli vede il giudice prudente che non vi sia malitia, né la lettura di essi habbia causato mal effetto in dette persone, né generato qualche dubbio in materia di fede . . .[66]

63 Cf. papal comments in the *Indexes* on the effect of texts on the reader, *ILI*, viii, 805 and 804 and ix, 924.

64 See Alfonso Mirto, 'Un inedito del Seicento sull'Inquisizione', *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 1/1 (1986), 99–138, 119–20, cf. Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, 338–9.

65 See Mirto, 119–20.

66 Ibid. 120.

In seventeenth-century inquisitorial practice, guidelines for the examination of readers of prohibited books show how precisely the profile of a reader was to be reconstructed. Aspects of investigation included the entire biography beginning with the reader's childhood, the places he had lived, the identity of all of his teachers, his cultural knowledge and his social network.[67]

Several censors working at the sixteenth-century Roman Court were familiar with the procedure of considering how a text would be received. Among them were doctors of theology or civil and canon law, cardinals, bishops, priors of religious orders, inquisitors, judges, protonotaries, teachers and the master of the sacred palace. Many of them published their own works or were engaged in publications by ecclesiastical institutions; that is to say, they were familiar with writing and, to a certain degree, with rhetoric, especially homiletics and writing strategies. Valier was one of them and, in addition to his *De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris*, his *De rhetorica ecclesiastica ad clericos* in three books contains a neatly developed reception theory. The study and knowledge of reception, Valier claims, was a necessary component of the ecclesiastical orator's training.

Valier identifies various types ("genera") of listeners ("auditores"). He imagines a heterogeneous group of listeners, and he employs the term *genus* that is used in the *Index* to refer to types of authors ("genus authorum"). The second book of his ecclesiastical rhetoric opens with the theme of commotion ("commotio"), the arousal of feelings, and he begins with a quotation from Cicero's *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* which he found in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*: "Docere est debitum, delectare honorarium, flectere victoria." Three aims, teaching, delighting and moving, are important to Valier, especially moving the mind in order to win over the listener. Valier maintains that an orator in service to Christ must prove the Catholic truth. In order to win over ("expugnare") the listener, the orator had to move the feelings of the listener's soul.[68] Valier is perfectly familiar with the idea of manipulation. He tries to demonstrate how to console a listener, how to make him follow his or her vocation in Catholic society, how to arouse various affects and feelings, forms of love, anger, sorrow, mercy, fear, shame, joy and hope. He describes several other techniques which, in wise combination, would permit the orator access to the listener's soul in order to conquer him.

Technique and strategy were to be adjusted to the aim, so the distinctions between types of listeners are explained. As human beings ("genera hominum") can be differentiated, so can listeners be grouped ("genera"). He offers

67 Cf. Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, 339.

68 See Valier, *De rhetorica ecclesiastica*, II.1.

four distinctions: nature, discipline or art, election and God's judgment ("Varia auditorum genera distingui possunt, aut natura, aut disciplina, aut electione, aut occulto Dei iudicio"). The first distinction, "nature," includes the sexes, relationships and age. The second, "discipline" or art, includes teachers and disciples. The third, "election," takes into account that listeners choose their friends according to age and custom. The fourth distinction, God's "occult judgment," distinguishes between those who face adversity and those who live in prosperity. The characteristics of each group are explained and Valier argues that they must be considered by the ecclesiastical orator in order to successfully influence the groups. Accordingly, he sets out techniques of moving and manipulating them.[69]

Valier's bibliography shows that text composition and writing were two of his fields of specialization. This was probably not the case with other censors, but one may assume that they were acquainted at least with rhetoric, particularly homiletics, through their education and work in service to the Church. Some censors may have learned from their pastoral experience, while others may have been familiar with the role of the reader through manuscript culture.

---

69 Ibid. II.25–42.

CHAPTER 3

Mechanisms of the Roman *Index*

3.1 The *Libri Omnes* Principle

In order to find out which books were prohibited, one must do more than simply consult the *Index* editions and compare the entries. In the sixteenth century the Roman *Index* did not claim to list all prohibited books explicitly by title; unofficial lists were also drawn up by the central censorial authorities ("indici scritti a mano"), which mention additional prohibited texts, although they are not comprehensive.[1]

General prohibitions were implemented in addition to single prohibitions, as is already evident in the *Index* of Paul IV. Laws figured in the third class of anonymous books under the letter 'L' with the incipit "Libri omnes, qui…", "libri, qui…" or "libri illi, qui…"[2] The *Index* of 1564 includes a revised and extended version of general prohibitions entitled *Regulae confectae per patres a Tridentina Synodo*, of which there are ten. They precede the lists of books and, according to Pius IV, in addition to serving a prohibitory role they were intended to inform the public of principles regarding the form and content of Roman Catholic censorship. All texts with the characteristics mentioned in these prohibitions were prohibited. This form of prohibition was a strategy that could likewise be found in the French *Catalogue des livres censurez* of 1544. The *Catalogue* contains a section entitled *Censura librorum sequentium et similium*. It might have served the Roman Inquisition as a model, but the idea of general prohibition is much older and could already be found in Roman law, which influenced canon law in many ways.[3]

A draft of the Tridentine *Rule* VII (previously *Rule* X), prepared by a deputation for the reform of the *Index* at Trent, further elucidates how these general

1 See Appendix, the introduction to doc. 1.1 n. 17.

2 On the category "class" ("classis") in the *Index* see n. 44. On the general prohibitions of the *Index* see in particular Schwedt, 'Der römische Index der verbotenen Bücher', in *Censor censorum, gesammelte Aufsätze von Hermann Schwedt*, Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006), 15–31, 20, Wolf, *Index*, 29, Rozzo, *La letteratura italiana*, 201.

3 Cf. *Catalogue des livres censurez*, 1544, in *ILI*, I, Jacob Gretser, S.J., *De iure et more prohibendi, expurgandi, et abolendi libros haereticos et noxios, Adversus Franciscum Iunium Calvinistam et Ioannem Pappum aliosque praedicantes lutheranos* (Ingolstadt: Ex officina typographici Ederina, per Andream Angermarium, 1603), I, xx, Jean Gaudemet, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'église aux IV^e et V^e siècles* (Paris: Sirey, 1957).

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_004

laws combined with the prohibitions of single authors and works. The draft lists dialogues of Lucian and Pietro Aretino, the *Celestina*, unexpurgated books by Martial and Ovid's *Ars amatoria*, and declares all books similar to these prohibited. Bishops and inquisitors were to find such books in their fields of activity.

> Libri, qui res lascivas seu obscoenas ex professo tractant, narrant aut docent, cum non solum fidei, sed etiam morum ratio habenda sit eorum: qui huiusmodi librorum lectione facile corrumpi solent, quales sunt aliqui Luciani dialogi, Petri Aretini dialogi, *Celestina* in quavis lingua, Martialis non expurgatus, de arte amandi Ovidii et similes, sub poena excommunicationis legi seu teneri prohibeantur, a qua nonnisi ab ordinariis traditis illis libris, si eos adhuc habent, absolvi possint. Qui vero similes libros vendiderit aut quovis modo alteri tradiderit, eandem excommunicationis sententiam statim incurrat et libros amittat. Qui autem sint similes libri, episcopus vel inquisitor cum consilio duorum theologorum diiudicet.[4]

This method of prohibition was based on a mechanism that worked similarly to the author principle discussed above; I will refer to it as the '*libri omnes* principle.' Up until now the general laws have received little attention among scholars of early modern literature, presumably due to their vague formulation and radical implications. They make interpretation difficult, particularly in the cases of the Tridentine *Rules* VII, VIII and IX, which had severe impacts on poetical texts.[5] It may be for this reason that critics have repeatedly come

4 See *Regulae generales*, before 27 November 1563, *Concilii Tridentini tractatuum*, ii.i: *Complectens tractatus a translatione concilii usque ad sessionem XXII conscriptos*, ed. Hubertus Jedin, in *Concilium Tridentinum: diariorum, actorum, epistolarum, tractatuum nova collectio* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1938), xiii, 603–6, 605.

5 *Regula* VII prohibits all texts treating, narrating or teaching lascivious or obscene things. For more details see below Ch. 5. According to *Regula* VIII all texts whose main subject matter is "good" ("bonum") are to be cleansed from traces of heresy, superstition, divination and impiety, see *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii and below Chap. 4. See *Regula* IX (first versions in *Indexes* of 1557–1559), which prohibits texts containing various forms of superstition. For details see Ch. 4 and 5. For an overview of the other *Regulae*: *R* I confirms prohibitions pronounced by popes and ecumenical councils before 1515, *RR* II, III, V explain the censorship of books by heretics, *RR* III, IV vernacular and Latin translations of the Sacred Scripture, and *R* VI regulates the censorship of vernacular literature on theological controversies. *R* X confirms the decree *Inter sollicitudines*, explains formal modalities of censorship and clarifies duties and obligations of editors and booksellers.

up against limits when consulting the entries of the *Index* in order to understand which books were prohibited and why, for, although some books were censored and expurgated, they did not appear on this particular blacklist. One example is Dante's *Vita Nuova*. No sixteenth-century Roman *Index* mentions this work, yet it was printed in a radically purged version.

In order to better comprehend Counter-Reformation *Index* politics, one must acknowledge that the Roman censorial authorities consciously withheld information from the public. This becomes apparent in the correspondence between Duke Carlo Emanuele I of Savoy and the Roman Inquisition. In reference to the vague wording of the Tridentine *Rule* VII, the duke explains how such wording made it difficult to understand which books were prohibited. He requested the Inquisition to provide him with a list of all such books. The Inquisition refused to provide a direct response on the grounds that the number of banned texts made it too long a list: "… è impossibile che si possi dar nota in particolare delli libri che si presuppongono trattar di cose obscene et lascive, poiché sono infinitissimi et ogni giorno più se ne vedono uscir fuori."[6] This reply makes clear the radical nature of *Rule* VII.

The vagueness of *Rule* VII was discussed and questioned by commissions and congregations reforming the *Index* in the sixteenth century, notably at the Council of Trent. It was argued that the vague wording made censorship more difficult because there was no benchmark; the rule left too much room for subjective interpretation. Suggestions were made to list banned works by title in order to avoid misunderstandings, but some warned that the mere mention of the banned titles ensured them longevity. In reference to *damnatio memoriae*, a strategy used in ancient Rome, they argued that censorship should aim to erase all public memory of banned books.[7] In the end, the second position prevailed: vagueness, or non-information, was preferred. One might ask whether the strategy of withholding information, i.e. leaving the public in uncertainty, was also used to intimidate authors, readers, editors, printers and book sellers

6 Cf. Fragnito, 'Aspetti e problemi della censura espurgatoria', in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici, un cantiere aperto*, Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2000), 161–78, 164, quotes a *Memoriale* of January 1597 that is reproduced in *Scriniolum Sanctae Inquisitionis Astensis* (Asti: Virgilio Giangrandi, 1610), 169. Cf. *Directorium inquisitorum*, q. 27 c. III/315 and Prosperi, 'Censurare le favole', in *Il romanzo*, ed. Franco Moretti, (Turin: Einaudi, 2001), i: *La cultura del romanzo*, 71–106, 96–7.

7 Cf. *Adnotationes in regulas de indice librorum*, 27 November 1563, in *Concilii Tridentini tractatuum*, pars 2.1: *Complectens tractatus a translatione concilii usque ad sessionem XXII conscriptos*, ed. Hubertus Jedin, in *Concilium Tridentinum: diariorum, actorum, epistolarum, tractatuum nova collectio*, ed. by Societas Goerresiana (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1938), xiii, 606–7, 606.

by making them uncertain of what was allowed to make them more cautious in their production.[8]

Ten years later, in the course of an *Index* reform under Pius V, the discussion was readdressed. Members and *consultores* of the Congregation for the Index, such as the apostolic protonotary Pietro Galesini, Cardinal de' Medici and Jesuit theologian, insisted that books of love ("libri de amoribus"), especially comedies, be prohibited *nominatim* by listing their titles in the *Index*, but to no avail.[9] Another attempt was made by Robert Bellarmine in the early 1590s with the same consequence. Bellarmine recommended the inclusion of Renaissance Latin poetry in the *Index nominatim* such as Giovanni Pontano's *Lepidina, Hendecasyllaba, Tumuli* and *Epigrammata*.[10]

To conclude, the sources reveal the difficulties encountered when this strategy and mechanism of prohibition was utilized by censorial authorities. These difficulties certainly impacted daily censorship practice and may at times have rendered it inconsistent and inefficient. Nonetheless, it is clear that the *libri omnes* principle, intended to have an enormous impact on the creation and reception of poetry, was successful, as shown by the changing literary landscape of the sixteenth century. One might counter that, even after the promulgation of the *Index* of Trent, numerous texts contravening *Rule* VII and other general prohibitions were printed, proving that general prohibition and the entire *Index* were actually ineffective. Certainly the enormity of this and other general prohibitions made it hard to control, and often authors or printers were able to trick the censorial authorities and illegally publish books that contravened the laws. The influence of censorship on poetic creation and reception, made possible by the influence of such laws, is evident and acknowledged, and will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapters.

---

8 Cf. Bonardo, Appendix, doc. 2.2.

9 Galesini, *De sequentibus et ultimis regulis*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 372r–5v, 373v: "Haec item regula de libris impudicae et non verecundae lectionis ut in executionem inducatur, nominatim certo indice exprimendi sunt istiusmodi libri de amoribus, ac praesertim comoediae. Hicque cavendum praesertim est de comoedis, qui huc atque illuc vagantur comoediasque agunt plenas turpitudinum." See also the comment by a Jesuit theologian, congregation of 31 April 1571, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 2r: "Dubium V.: De libris obscenis, et lascivis rebus tractantes an in specie sint prohibiti vel in genere, vel aliqua eorum pars."

10 See Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 158 and ibid., *Bellarminiana*, doc. 12c (autograph Bellarmini), Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. K, 79r–80r.

3.2 On the Censorship of Literary Genres

Literary genres and subgenres were particularly useful for listing prohibited texts. As demonstrated by Paolo Constabile, master of the sacred palace, in his blacklist updates of the 1570s, it was possible to combine these genres with the above-mentioned *libri omnes* principle. His updates include literary subgenres deemed to be of a suspicious or potentially dangerous nature, such as dishonest comedies ("Comedie dishoneste di nissuna sorte"), dishonest and lascivious madrigals ("Madrigali, dishonesti & lascivi") and canzoni ("Canzone dishoneste, & lascive, cioè in canto di nessuna sorte") as well as love letters of any kind ("Lettere amorose di nessuna sorte").[11] Characteristics to be prohibited were dishonesty and lasciviousness. "Lasciviousness" might have referred to erotic content, a possible characteristic of canzoni, madrigals and love letters. Eventually, the prohibitions pertained to the characteristics and further development ('genre principle') of the literary subgenres themselves, intended or not.

The internal manuscript *Index* of 1576 shows a similar pattern. Constabile and Scipione Cardinal Rebiba, dean ("decanus") of the Roman Inquisition, commissioned Giovanni Di Dio of Florence to prepare the *Index*, which, according to Vincenzo Bonardo's *Discorso*, shows similarities to the local *Index* of Parma of 1580. Di Dio went further than Constabile, either on his behalf or independently, by including song genres in the section of suspect vernacular books, explaining that they posed a danger to Christianity: "Villanelle in canto et così canzoni alla Napolitana le quali apportano grandissimo danno alla Christianità." It was not single texts but genres that played a role here.[12]

Because the prohibited genres were qualified by characteristics, prohibition went beyond the indicated genres: it extended to texts of other genres with similar characteristics. Here again the *libri omnes* principle comes into play. The characteristics pertaining to morality demonstrate how Constabile interpreted the laws of the *Index*, especially the seventh *Rule* of the *Index* of 1564. More importantly, this method of expressing prohibition reveals that either Constabile or his collaborators possessed knowledge of profane poetry and music or, more precisely, poetic and song genres and variations.

11 See ILI, ix, 747.

12 See Giovanni Di Dio, *Index authorum, qui vel aperte haeretici sunt, aut certe de haeresi valde suspecti esse videntur, aut contra bonos mores vitaeque pudicitiam aliqua continent. Postrema sunt addita opera sanctorum doctorum sive etiam prophanorum, quae ratione impressionis aut interpretis sive quod scholia atque annotationes haeretici alicuius autori contineant minus probanda videntur* (Rome, 1576), in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XIV.

This knowledge was consciously applied in censorship politics. The *Index* of Di Dio even describes a song genre in an entry of music scores: "Madrigali cioè a tre voci li quali sono Moresche et altra sorte de Madrigali di simil sorte a quattro et a cinque voci, stampati in Venetia per Gironimo Scotto."[13] His precision is noteworthy because music did not have first priority in Roman censorship and he could have formulated the two entries in more general terms.

This same method had been employed even earlier under Pope Paul IV when the pasquinade genre was put on the *Index*. The entry only concerns pasquinades in which God, the saints, the sacraments, and the Catholic Church and its cult or the Holy See are "detracted" ("detrahunt"). Under Pius IV another entry was added, referring to all pasquinades composed of words from the Sacred Scripture ("Pasquilli omnes ex verbis sacrae scripturae confecti"). This entry, like the first, was included in the subsequent Sistine and Clementine *Indexes*.[14] Moreover, much like Constabile's *Aviso*, this law makes clear that texts of other subgenres that shared the same prohibited characteristics were also proscribed.

With regard to the *Index* of 1564, which already contained a law against immoral texts, it is reasonable to wonder whether Constabile's *Aviso* expressed new prohibitions against poetic genres, but such was not the case; it seems rather to have drawn increased attention to particular poetic genres and subgenres, possibly due to more radical censorship politics under Pope Pius V at a time when the *Index* of 1564 was again being altered and aligned with Paulinian ideals. It certainly indicates that a refined prohibition strategy was being developed in order to make censorship more efficient.

Both Constabile's *Aviso* and Di Dio's *Index* make it clear how much importance was being placed on morality and profane vernacular poetry as aspects of censorship. They must have been aware of the relation between the form, content and characteristics of poetic texts. Their use of this knowledge in defining texts in the context of censorship politics reveals intelligent and flexible thinking.

Censorial judgments on literary works made in the same years, such as the anonymous *Avertimento* on Speroni's dialogue on love, *Dialogo d'amore*, reveal a similar pattern of thought. Reading this text, it would have been possible for Speroni's censor to understand that lascivious love compels man to think of,

13 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XIV.

14 For the *Indexes* of 1557 and 1558/59, see ILI, viii, 743 and 779: "Pasquilli omnes, omnesque conscriptiones in quibus Deo, aut Sanctis, aut Sacramentis, aut Catholicae Ecclesiae, et eius cultui, aut Apostolicae Sedi quomodoqunque detrahatur." Cf. *Index* of 1564, in ibid., 865, ILI, ix, 893, 898 and 969.

compose and write poems; more precisely, sonnets and canzoni and other texts that pertain to carnal love: "… che la ragione anchora sia occupata in questo amor lascivo de gli innamorati et che s'ingegni l'huomo di pensar, di comporre et di scriver sonetti et canzoni et cose appertinenti a questo amore …" Whether it was on the basis of his knowledge, information revealed in the dialogue, or both, the censor established a relation between carnal love, composition and writing, and literary and music genres; in other words, he established a relation between content and form, and, in a wider sense, content and poetics. This is remarkable because, similar to Di Dio, this censor may have been part of the circle around Constabile and Guglielmo Sirleto.[15]

On the one hand, this prohibition strategy meant that the indicated genres were, to a certain degree, protected from prohibition, because only those texts sharing the qualities or characteristics set out were targeted for censorship. On the other hand, this strategy entailed the manipulation of genres in order to erase such qualities. Censorship, therefore, had direct implications on poetics and contemporary poetic composition. Poetics was not a primary concern of the central censorial authorities in Rome, yet their censors had sufficient knowledge of poetry to understand its power.

Chivalric epic poetry faced severe consequences as a result of this method of censorship. Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* is not explicitly mentioned ("nominatim") in the sixteenth-century Roman *Indexes* or in additional blacklists of the Roman censorial authorities. Nevertheless, according to Girolamo Baruffaldi, the government of Rome ordered to destroy sample copies of the edition published in Rome in 1543 by Antonio Blado. Fragnito, too, mentions a burning of the *Furioso* at the end of the century. Moreover, in the course of Constabile's work on profane lyrics and drama in the 1570s, his socius Rossi instructed Eliseo Capys, the local inquisitor of Bologna, to prevent the publication of stories, comedies and other books about love, as Rome destroyed such works. Booksellers were not allowed to order them, nor printers allowed to print them. Four months later, Rossi expressed the concept more precisely: Ariosto's works could no longer be sold.[16] Ariosto was banned from the book market, the equivalent of prohibition.

---

15 For the document and case, see Appendix, doc. 1.1.

16 See Rossi's letter of 21 March 1576, in A. Rotondò, 'Nuovi documenti per la storia dell'Indice dei libri prohibiti (1572–1638)', *Rinascimento*, s. 2, 3 (1963), 145–211, doc. 5; Rossi's letter dated 17 July 1576, in Bologna, Biblioteca dell Archiginnasio di Bologna, b. 1860, n. 237. Cf. Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, 162, and Antonio Samaritani, *Religione cittadina, autoriforma cattolica, malessere ereticale a Cento nel secolo XVI tra Estensi e Controriforma* (Ferrara: Corbo, 1997), 136–7.

Rossi's information is not precise enough, however; it might only have referred to Ariosto's *Satire*, which figure in the *Libri parte sospesi fin a novo aviso dalla S. Romana et Universal Inquisitione et parte dal tutto prohibiti* of 1574.[17] By contrast, the files of the Congregation for the Index of subsequent years suggest that it could also refer to Ariosto's complete works ("opere") including the *Furioso*. According to the *Diari* of the Congregation for the Index, in 1609, Ludovico Ystella, then master of the sacred palace, asked whether the printing of the *Furioso* could be permitted in Rome, and the Congregation's answer was affirmative.[18] Ystella's question suggests a prior prohibition or suspension of the poem, possibly in reference to the 1576 prohibition which was ordered by Rossi in order to impede the publication of Ariosto's works. Furthermore, there is proof that the romanzo was extensively censored and discussed. The Congregation for the Index ordered the local Inquisition of Ferrara to expurgate the *Furioso* so that an amended version could be printed. It is not quite clear, however, why the Roman censorial authorities publicly kept silent in this case.

Significantly, the book market indicates that the number of print editions of the *Furioso* diminished considerably after the 1570s, and continued to do so at a greater rate throughout the 1590s.[19] An intense development in epic poetics and poetry was taking place during that time which sought to align epic poetry with Counter-Reformation cultural policy. Tasso's poetological and poetic writings are an outstanding example. It is well known that this development was accompanied by severe criticism of the romanzo genre, resulting in its eventual disappearance. Among other things, these developments may be due to censorship.

---

17 See Constabile, *Ex Vercellis. Libri parte sospesi fin a nuovo aviso dalla S. Romana et Universal Inquisitione et parte dal tutto prohibiti* (22 May 1574), in *ILI*, ix, 757, see also Di Dio, section *Libri volgari sospetti* under the letter *S*.

18 See ACDF, Ind. Diar. II, 10r. Cf. Girolamo Baruffaldi, *La vita di m. Lodovico Ariosto* (Ferrara: Bianchi e Negri, 1807), 299, Giuseppe J. Ferrazzi, *Bibliografia ariostesca* (Bassano: Pozzato, 1881), 70, Giuseppe Agnelli and Giuseppe Ravegnani, *Annali delle edizioni ariostee*, con CXIV tavole fuori testo, Zanichelli (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1933), vol. 1, 64, Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, 160, n. 62. On Ystella see Jacques Quétif and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* (reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1960), II, i: 1499–1639 A.D., 391. On the files on the *Furioso*, see Appendix, doc. 1.4–5.

19 See Klaus W. Hempfer, *Diskrepante Lektüren: Die Orlando-Furioso-Rezeption im Cinquecento* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987), 48–9.

3.3 An Attempt to Manipulate 'Stylistic' Modes of Writing?

The prohibition of Bembo's *Rime* was first made public by Constabile's May *Aviso* of 1574. The *Aviso* includes prohibited books ("libri prohibiti") as well as suspended books ("libri sospesi"), books that were only temporarily prohibited. It does not indicate, however, whether the *Rime* were prohibited or suspended. In the same year Bembo's *Rime* appeared on another blacklist drafted by Constabile and sent to the Inquisition of Vercelli. This list contains books which had been suspended pending further instruction from the Roman Inquisition, so it is possible that Bembo's *Rime* might only have been suspended.

The *Index* of 1576 by Giovanni Di Dio assigns Bembo's *Rime* to the category of suspect vernacular books ("Libri volgari sospetti"), marked with the digit "2," the second class of prohibited books. There is no reference to an expurgation, as in other cases; however, there is an anonymous censorship of Bembo, Ariosto and Sannazaro's *Rime*, the *Avertimento sopra le Rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo et del Sannazaro* dating from the same period. This is important as it proves that Bembo's work was examined together with other love lyrics written in the same style for the Roman censorial authorities in 1570, and that this judgment was received and archived by them. It was produced by the same censor who assessed Speroni's *Dialogo d'amore*, and may have contributed to the destiny of Bembo's poetry.[20] The *Index of Prohibited and Suspended Books* (*Index librorum prohibitorum et suspensorum*) of Parma of 1580 likewise lists Bembo's *Rime*, while local blacklists mention only Bembo's *Stanze*, such as the one from Alessandria dated 1580. The *Stanze* had appeared in Bembo's *Rime* edition of 1530; therefore, apparently, only a part of the edition was chosen for prohibition. By 1593, Bembo's entire *Rime* figured again in the Roman *Index* in the second class, accompanied by the remark that they were prohibited until corrected.[21]

This short overview demonstrates that the Roman censorial authorities repudiated Bembo's *Rime*. One could assume that the *Rime* edition was prohibited because it contained the *Stanze*, which appear on the local blacklist

20 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2.

21 Cf. Constabile, *Aviso*, in *ILI*, ix, 747, Constabile, *Libri parte sospesi fin a novo aviso dalla S. Romana et Universal Inquisitione, et parte dal tutto prohibiti* (Vercelli, 1574), ibid. 757, *Index* of Parma (1580), ibid. 753, *Index* of 1593, ibid. 910. For Bembo's *Stanze* see *Nota de libri prohibiti, et di alcuni sospesi, fin che di loro venghi fatta nuova espurgatione dalla Santissima Inquisitione universale, Oltra quelli che sono contenuti nell'Indice generale fatto già per ordine et decreto del sacro Concilio di Trento* (according to *ILI* c.1580), in ibid., 749, *Annotatio librorum prohibitorum, et eorum qui suspensi fuerunt usque ad novam expurgationem Santissime Universalis Inquisitionis preter eos qui continentur in Indice Generali edicto sacri Concilii Tridentini decreto* (Alessandria, 1580), ibid. 751.

of Alessandria. It was a common strategy to prohibit an entire book based on a single section requiring censorship, but the anonymous *Avertimento sopra le Rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo et del Sannazaro* clearly shows that its author believed that not only the *Stanze* but also the *Rime* required censorship. He severely criticized a large number of passages in the works of all three poets as well as central characteristics of profane vernacular poetry, particularly Petrarchist poetry.[22] What is not yet clear is why Constabile focused on Bembo's *Rime* rather than those of Ariosto or Sannazaro. Evidently a prohibition strategy was at work here, and this brings to light a new aspect of Counter-Reformation censorship.

One may assume that the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime* was linked more to his person than his work. Bembo had been a cardinal and member of a spiritual chivalric order, like many poets who imitated him. The prohibition could well have been a means of protecting the reputation of the cardinal, a representative of the Roman Church.[23] This raises the question of why explicit prohibition was at all necessary if *Rule* VII of the Tridentine *Index* included all lascivious poetry. Perhaps this motive concerned the use of Bembo's poetry as a model for sixteenth-century love lyrics. Bembo's *Rime* was a model for Petrarchist writing, especially Petrarchist love lyrics, both in and beyond the Appenine peninsula. His *Stanze* became a model for an entire genre, the "lyrical narrative" poem in *ottava rima*.[24]

Considering the *Avertimento* may take us further. Although it deals in detail with the three Petrarchists, its introduction accuses vernacular poets of committing serious mortal sins ("gravissimi peccati mortali") in their work, which he regards as a "custom" ("costume").[25] In fact, the criticized characteristics typical of Petrarch's poetry and forms of Petrarchism can be traced back to medieval love lyrics such as the adoration of a lady, her deification, her influence on the lover's affections and their sublimation as well as the sublimation of the lover.

The files of the Congregation for the Index do not reveal the consequences of this judgment, but the *Avertimento* explains why eleven editions of ver-

22 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2.

23 Cf. Giovanni Della Casa and Carlo Gualteruzzi, *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa—Carlo Gualteruzzi (1525–1549)*, ed. Ornella Moroni (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1986), 537 and Cecil H. Clough, *Pietro Bembo's Library as Represented Particularly in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1965), 49–50.

24 On the role of Bembo's *Stanz*e see Johannes Bartuschat, 'Le Triomphe de Vénus et de la poésie: autour des *Stanze*', *Italique: poésie italienne de la Renaissance*, 14 (2011), 175–204, 177.

25 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2.

nacular *Rime* figure in the *Index* of Giovanni Di Dio. Among them are works by single poets and entire poem collections which assemble works by all the renowned poets of the sixteenth century such as the *Rime di diversi nobili huomini et eccellenti poeti nella lingua thoscana*, *Libro secondo* (in 8°, Venice: Gabriele Giolito, 1547) and *Rime di diversi auttori raccolte per il Ferentilli* (in 12°, Venice, 1571), identified as *Primo volume della scielta di stanze di diversi autori toscani. Raccolte da m. Agostino Ferentilli, et da lui con diligenza riviste* (Venice: Gli heredi di Marchiò Sessa, 1571). Both volumes are assigned to the second class of the *Index*.[26]

Further explanations can be found in the *Index* of 1564. *Rule* VII makes the authorial intention behind a text a crucial criterion of censorial judgment. A text was prohibited if it dealt with, narrated or taught lascivious or obscene things ("res lascivas seu obscoenas . . . tractant, narrant aut docent") "on purpose" ("ex professo"). The qualification "on purpose" is important because, aside from the prohibition of particular content, it posed another problem for love poets; their goal of imitating Bembo or Petrarch implied the intention of writing of sins. As a result, poets who imitated Bembo or Petrarch had to carefully select which elements to imitate.

Imitation of Bembo or Petrarch as a poetic strategy was therefore only possible through moral or spiritual reform, or both. Girolamo Malipiero sought to realize this in the *Petrarca spirituale*, a work accepted and praised in an anonymous *Memoriale* found among the files of the Roman censorial authorities.[27] *Rule* VII went beyond restricting poetic material; it restricted the freedom to choose what to write and put under surveillance the principle of imitation that was central to Renaissance poetry.

Yet, if Bembo's works were prohibited in order to suppress or manipulate Petrarchist poetry, why did Constabile choose Bembo's works rather than those of his model Petrarch? Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, the model of Italian vernacular lyric poetry, was in fact tolerated by the Roman censorial authorities after initial radical procedures of suppression. As mentioned above, there is evidence

26 Cf. Di Dio, under the letter *R*, section *Libri volgari sospetti* (the numbers indicate the classes of the *Index* to which Di Dio assigned the works): "2 Rime del Bembo, 2 Rime et sonetti del Burchiello, 2 Rime di Vital Papazoni, 1572 Venetia, 2 Rime di m. Agostino Rocchetta, Firenze 1558, 2 Rime et Prose volgari di m. Giovanni Brevio, Roma 1545, 2 Rime di diversi, in 8°, Venetia 1547, 2 Rime di diversi auttori raccolte per il Ferentilli, in 12° Venetia 1571, 2 Rime del Fiamma, in Venetia, 3 Rime di diversi per le donne Romane raccolte da Mutio Manfredi, stampate in Bologna 1575 per Alessandro Benacci, Rime della signora Veronica Franca Venetiana, stampate senza nome del stampatore nel 1575 le quali sono pessime contra li buoni costumi, 2 Rime di m. Luigi Alemanni."

27 See Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, 175v.

that in the 1550s the Roman Inquisition burned the *Canzoniere*,[28] but that suddenly came to an end and the Roman authorities kept silent about the work. At the time only sonnets criticizing the Curia, in addition to parts of Petrarch's letters, were indirectly prohibited due to the prohibition of Vergerio's publication. Only at the end of the century did those sonnets receive their own entry in the Roman *Index*.

This development is remarkable because, as explained above, the Roman Inquisition, and later the Congregation for the Index, did not hesitate to prohibit entire works based on brief passages requiring censorship. However, the sonnets, motives for the prohibition of Vergerio's book, were prohibited in all other books and rigorously blacked out in many *Canzoniere* editions. This is another example of the effect of the *libri omnes* principle; the same treatment should have been applied to the letters which Vergerio had published. The question remains as to why the Inquisition initially decided to burn the *Canzoniere* and then suddenly tolerated it, choosing instead to prohibit another work that imitated it and opting for silence regarding Petrarch.

Maria Antonietta Passarelli assumes that the Congregation for the Index avoided a correction or prohibition of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* because it deemed it and Dante's poetry to be "linguistic monuments."[29] This assumption seems plausible and can be corroborated by files of the Congregation for the Index. There are indeed instructions on expurgation that suggest that texts of high literary value should be corrected carefully. There is little evidence, however, that proves the Congregation's high estimation of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, or the Congregation's respect for Petrarch's role as a poetic model.[30] The *Memoriale* declares Petrarch to be a very vain man ("vanissimus homo") undeserving of the title "spiritualis" ascribed to him by Fra Girolamo Malipiero.[31] What is more, this *Memoriale* places Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque fortunae* on a list of books to be expurgated together with a range of writings by the Church Fathers.[32] Even if profane works of high literary value were, in theory, to be treated with indulgence, the expurgation of the Church Fathers' works shows how far the censorial authorities were prepared to go.

---

28 See Owens and Agee, 219–305, doc. 39/270.

29 Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*', 192. Passarelli refers to a comment by Alfonso Chacón on the *Divina Commedia*, ibid. at n. 71.

30 Cf. Bellarmine, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, in id., *Varii argumenti opuscula* (Cologne: Bernardus Gualtherus, 1617), 176.

31 Cf. [Guglielmo Sirleto?], *Memoriale*, in Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, 175v.

32 Ibid.

Significantly, Barrio, who prepared censorships of poetry for Sirleto, emphasizes Petrarch's role as a model for sixteenth-century vernacular poets because his work infected so many others and made them his followers ("asseclae").[33] It is not clear how familiar members of the Congregation for the Index or the master of the sacred palace were with poetic imitation, but Sirleto was also librarian of the Vatican Library. Several clerics and prelates read and wrote Petrarchist poems or engaged poets to write them,[34] a fact well known within the Vatican walls. Fra Girolamo Malipiero, for example, stated in the first half of the sixteenth century that many young people "of the world" ("del mondo"), both within and without Italy, were studying Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and imitating it in order to describe similar love passions in song; in fact, Petrarch's vanities were being studied and commented upon more extensively than the gospels.[35] One should not ignore the fact that censorial authorities were well aware of poetic imitation and Petrarchist forms of writing.

Consequently, there may have been other reasons for the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime*, aside from respect for a literary work. I would like to approach Passarelli's theories from a slightly different angle. From the sources it is clear that some censors considered Petrarch's love lyrics immoral. Perhaps rather than showing respect for his work, the strategy of silence aimed to protect what the work, or Petrarch himself, signified for the cultural world of the peninsula and the peninsula's important cultural role in Europe: the avoidance of scandal. If the model poetry of Petrarch and the other Two Crowns was used by Protestants for propaganda against Catholics, the pride of 'Italian' culture was used as a weapon against the Roman Church. The prohibition of Boccaccio's *Decamerone* in 1559, as well as the subsequent corrections after the Council of Trent, was a hard blow for Italian poetry. If Petrarch had also been placed on the *Index* and expurgated, the Roman Inquisition would have proceeded against two figureheads of vernacular poetry. To admit in public that the model of Italian vernacular lyric poetry contained ideas contravening the Roman Church would have meant diminishing the peninsula's leading cultural role in Europe. It would certainly have aroused scandal and turmoil

33 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 408–9, also 406: "[Petrarch] id tetrum et lethale virus effudit et evomit." On Barrio's judgment of Petrarch as "scelestus auctor," Appendix, doc 1.3b. Cf. Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*', 190.

34 Cf. *Tempio alla divina Signora Giovanna d'Aragona*, all'Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Signore, il Signor Cristoforo Madruccio, Cardinal di Trento (Venice: Plinio Pietrasanta, 1555).

35 See Girolamo Malipiero, *Il Petrarca spirituale* (Venice: Francesco Marcolini da Forli, 1536), 3v.

which the censorial authorities endeavored to avoid, as Bonardo's discourse on the *Index* suggests.

But perhaps there is a much simpler explanation: The Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum* of the *Index* of 1596 contains two enlightening paragraphs (§§ iii and iv) on the treatment of books by Catholic authors, which are taken from the Sistine *Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri, Rule* x.[36] It distinguishes between books by "ancient Catholics" ("Catholicorum veterum," § iv) and "recent Catholics" ("Catholicorum recentiorum," § iii) written after the year 1515. Books by ancient Catholic authors were not to be corrected unless they had been changed by heretics or contained a flaw due to the typographer's negligence. The instruction ordained that if "momenti maiori" were found in such books, they were to be explained in the margins or in comments ("scholiis"). Books by recent or modern Catholic authors, written or published after 1515, were to be corrected as necessary, even if it required deletion.

It appears that the instructions refer to all Catholic authors, not only to those of religious works. It is therefore feasible that the instruction was also meant to regulate the treatment of profane vernacular works by Catholic authors. As a poet of the fourteenth century, Petrarch was considered an ancient Catholic, as was Dante, Boccaccio and a large number of medieval love poets. By contrast, Bembo's *Rime* edition of 1530 was considered a modern work and therefore subject to change. The crux of the matter is that the Clementine instruction was not published until 1596; therefore the distinction between ancient and modern Catholic authors might either have been an entirely new Sistine-Clementine phenomenon, or this *Index* was simply the first to record a previously unwritten rule that had nonetheless influenced censorship policy, even if only to a certain degree. This could explain the rich sixteenth-century commentaries accompanying Petrarch's works as well as missing entries of other medieval love poets in the sixteenth-century *Indexes*.

To return to the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime*, the only assessment of this work that I am aware of is the *Avertimento*, which deems language, stylistic means and ideas of his poetry heterodox and dangerous. As shown above, some can be described as Petrarchist, or more precisely, Bembist. Ideas and images of his *Stanze* were rejected as contradictory to the faith. Given Bembo's crucial role in sixteenth-century Petrarchism and the *stanze* genre, and considering that his prohibition was not necessary according to the *Index*, my thesis is that the Roman prohibition of his *Rime*, including that of his *Stanze*, is to be understood in a wider context. It was not only about Bembo's work; the *libri omnes* principle concerned all writings with the same or similar characteristics, a 'stylistic' mode of writing, now referred to as Bembism or

36 For the *Modus* see Appendix, doc. 2.1.

Petrarchism, and everything this mode of writing implied, such as ideas and feelings of any kind.

Critics have often wondered why the number of censorships of love poetry, especially lyric poetry, is relatively small. Various factors might account for this but must be investigated elsewhere. Only two factors are highlighted here for the purpose of better understanding why there are not many written statements on assessments on poetry. One factor is the consideration of poetic imitation as a principle of text production with which censors were familiar, as the documents clearly show. It was understood that errors and sins found in Petrarch were also to be found in his imitators, rendering it superfluous to examine all his imitators. The second factor is the *Index* mechanism of the *libri omnes* principle, which may have seemed the ideal method by which to control products infected by poetic imitation. The prohibition of Bembo's *Rime* would also have been more effective than that of Petrarch's poetry because it was clear that it encompassed forms that had developed from Petrarchan poetry as well as forms that would develop in the future. It served as an example and a limit to poets.

3.4 Reflections on Criteria of the *Inquisitio* of Texts

In order to understand why profane literary texts were censored, prohibited and expurgated, it is necessary to identify the criteria for Counter-Reformation censorship. This is not a simple task because, until the promulgation of the Clementine *Index* of 1596 which contained instructions on book correction (*Instructio de correctione librorum*), there was no official censorship guideline. One place to start looking for Counter-Reformation censorship criteria is in the single entries and general prohibitions, or *Rules*, listed in the Roman *Index* referred to above.[37] Critics, however, have found the general prohibitions to be too imprecise, leaving too much room for arbitrary interpretation. Consequently, the thesis has been put forward that, prior to the *Index* of 1596, Counter-Reformation censorship was not sufficiently regulated; subjective, arbitrary estimation appears to have been the criterion used to complement the vagueness of the *Index* laws.[38]

37 See Helm, 'Annäherung an die römisch-katholische Lesart volkssprachlicher Poesie in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts—ein Einblick in die gegenreformatorische Zensur', in *Zeichen setzen—Konvention, Kreativität, Interpretation*, Beiträge zum 24. Forum Junge Romanistik, Tübingen 14.–17. Mai 2008 (Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2009), 415–34.

38 Cf. Fragnito, 'Aspetti e problemi', ead., *Proibito capire*, 165ss, Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 36ss, 207s.

There may well have been censors who did not properly understand the texts they judged or whose judgments were inconsistent or self-contradictory. In the study of the censorship of poetry, however, such cases were usually reported for censorship outside of Rome and commissioned by local inquisitions. The problem is that focusing on deficits and mistakes, without acknowledging the context in which they came about, can conjure an image of ignorant, incapable Roman censorial authorities engaged in improper, perhaps illegitimate and unjust censorship practices. Such an image can have serious implications on the study of Counter-Reformation censorship. While the image may contain some elements of truth, it can indirectly corroborate studies that depict censors, rather than authors, as victims, thereby exonerating Counter-Reformation censorship and the Roman Church from blame, when censors may eventually come to be seen as having been victims of ignorance. It is important not to allow such an image to taint further research, or to diminish our understanding of the impact censorship had on poetry, culture, human thought and life in general. For this reason it is important to identify not only the deficits of censorial practice but also the mechanisms, strategies and instruments that are not always evident.

To begin with, the *Index* was an official publication of the Counter-Reformation Roman Church, notorious for its well-thought-out propaganda methods. Pius IV explained that the reading of books of heretics corrupted not only "simpliciores homines" but also learned people ("doctos, eruditosque"). The pope wanted the *Index* to provide a "remedy" ("remedium") for this evil ("malo") phenomenon in the form of a catalogue of books that were either heretical, suspected of being so or damaging to morals and piety. The pope demanded that the *Index* and its laws, *Rules*, be observed by everyone under threat of penalty, in order to ensure that such perilous books were not being read or possessed by Catholics. For this reason the *Index* was to be made public, and every Catholic should be informed of it.[39] In other words: The *Index*, along with its laws, was "published" as an instrument for public information. Paleotti refers to the *Index* as the "norm" ("norma") to be used when attempting to distinguish between prohibited and unprohibited books,[40] but that does not imply that the catalogue was introduced as the one and only guideline for censorial assessment.

One might ask whether the *Index* is the right place to look for censorship guidelines, given the institution's tendency towards silence and secrecy. The files of the Congregation for the Index make clear that juridically and theologically

39 Cf. Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*.

40 See Paleotti, *De imaginibus sacris et profanis*, 144.

skilled members of the Congregation for the Index led extensive discussions regarding the formulation of the legal texts contained in the *Index* in order to render them as precise as possible,[41] as seen in files of the Council of Trent that contain notes on the discussions held by the council fathers. The files of the Congregation for the Index also contain rich material pertaining to revisions of the general laws that took place under Pius V and Sixtus V.[42] Moreover, not all decisions regarding censorship or law alterations were to be made public in order to avoid their abuse or other negative consequences. A good example is the regulation concerning the use of Scripture in poetic creation.

In the fourth session of the Council of Trent in 1546, a decree was issued, prohibiting the abuse of Sacred Scripture.[43] Fragnito has shown that on 24 August 1596, the Congregation for the Index prohibited the versification of sections of the Sacred Scripture composed after 1515. The decree was subsequently questioned and altered, though unofficially.[44]

Fragnito suggests that Giovan Maria Guanzelli da Brisighella, master of the sacred palace, demanded the reexamination of the decree of 1596 due to the influence of Cinzio Cardinal Aldobrandini, who furthered Tasso's work on *Mondo creato*, and to the efforts of other authors of tragedies and sacred poems. Brisighella drew attention to the fact that Sacred Scripture had been utilized in several poems published after 1515 that had not been prohibited, such as Sannazaro's *De partu Virginis* and Vida's *Christias*. He suggested that one should distinguish between entire or partial versifications of the Bible in texts where biblical stories were paraphrased. He argued that poets should not be forbidden to narrate biblical stories and to extend and adorn them with "variis Poetarum coloribus," just as historians should not be prohibited from treating the creation of the world or other themes of the Scripture. Brisighella convinced the cardinals of the Congregation of the strength of his argument, resulting in a 1601 declaration altering the decree to the effect that only the reproduction of 'original' texts was prohibited while paraphrasing, extending and ornamenting stories and themes was permitted as long as the truth and dignity of the Sacred Scripture was upheld.[45]

---

41 Cf. notes on the Sistine *Modus* (Appendix, doc. 2.1), in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. and Protocolli A–B.

42 For Trent see *Concilii Tridentini tractatuum*, for the Congregation for the Index Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. A and B.

43 See *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* of 8 April 1546, 'Concilium Tridentinum', in *Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien*, iii, 665.

44 See Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, 118.

45 Ibid. 119.

This declaration granted poets more freedom in their work, but was not made public ("non tamen imprimendum esse in edicto publicando") by the Congregation for the Index in order to maintain control over poetic licence by not encouraging poets to abuse their freedom. For this reason, the decree of 7 August 1603 reproduced the 24 August 1596 wording: "Sacra Scriptura et eius partes metrice conscriptae post annum 1515, et impressae omnino prohibentur,"[46] demonstrating that the strategies of censorship politics were far more complicated than it appears at first glance.

In order to form an initial idea of what knowledge and material censors may have been working with, one may consult the censorships themselves and find a variety of literature which in some cases suggests a sound knowledge of the faith and poetry. Their authors rarely noted the sources they had utilized, but when they did, the references were generally to well-known texts and authorities. They referred to the fundament of the Catholic faith, the Sacred Scripture, to explain and bolster their verdicts and interpretations. In his censorship of Petrarch, Barrio quotes from Solomon in his assessment of Petrarch's depictions of love and Laura, and from St Paul and the Psalms to show that lascivious love poetry should be suppressed.[47] Barrio used other authorities as well: he refers to Gregory the Great in matters of superstition and Priscillianism and to Augustine when dealing with the interpretation of profane poetry, human nature and sinfulness. In discussions of poetic language he points to Cyprianus and "caeteri sacri doctores," and in his censorship of the *Divina Commedia* Barrio cites St Antoninus. Where necessary and appropriate, he refers to classical authors such as Seneca. But not all censors were as well read as Barrio. Other sources likewise suggest that the *Index* could hardly have been the only source of orientation. Fra Sixtus of Siena is cited in a censorship of *Orlando furioso* by Tommaso Galletti, who based his criticism of the depiction of Merlin's ghost on the *Bibliotheca sancta* by the Dominican friar.[48] Inquisitor Arnaldo Albertino quotes from Cicero's *De officiis* in his inquisitorial manual *De agnoscendis assertionibus* in order to show, on the basis of an authority, that a discussion ought to start with a definition of its subject in order to clarify the discussion.[49]

---

46 Ibid. 119–20.

47 See Appendix, doc. 1.3a–b.

48 Ibid., doc. 1.4c.

49 Cf. Arnaldo Albertino, *De agnoscendis assertionibus Catholicis et haereticis tractatus*, auctore Arnaldo Albertino Maioricensi, olim Episcopo Pactensi, & Citerioris Siciliae Apostolico Inquisitore, nunc denuo post omnes editiones recognitus (Rome: In Aedibus Populi Romani, 1572), 1r.

This short overview refers to central written sources such as the Sacred Scripture and the Church Fathers; other sources used were works by saints and recognized theologians as well as the decrees of sixteenth-century councils such as the Fifth Lateran Council and the Council of Trent, as suggested by Pius IV.[50] Regarding poetry, *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* was particularly important, as were other decrees wherever the faith was concerned. Judgments of profane poetry implied knowledge derived from literature on heresiology, canon law and inquisitorial manuals, the latter having been compulsory reading for censors. Inquisitors were expected to be familiar with canon law that had been collated in manuals by and for inquisitors since the Middle Ages for daily practical use in the area of law, regulation, condemnation and background knowledge. Examples were given to explain how to examine a text.[51] Such manuals were known to local ordinaries and inquisitors, and served as yardsticks for censorial assessment.

In addition, the files of the Congregation for the Index show that Roman censors consulted local catalogues of books such as the Spanish *Index Expurgandorum ex Hispano et Lovaniensi Indice collectus*, which had been published by the Spanish Inquisition in 1584 with a section of expurgations.[52] But as Bonardo's *Discorso intorno all'Indice da farsi de libri prohibiti* reveals, the Spanish catalogue was not the only source used for orientation; the master of the sacred palace also kept Spanish documents on censorships in his archive which were used for the same purpose.[53]

It seems plausible that efforts were made in the sixteenth century to bring medieval and early modern inquisitorial literature up-to-date in order to improve the 'library' of the censor and inquisitor. Francisco Peña was a very zealous figure in this field. He was involved in the creation of the official edition of *Corpus iuris canonici*. He also provided commentaries on treatises on heresy and witchcraft and on inquisitorial manuals, such as the manual of Inquisitor Nicholas Eymerich, Cesare Carena's *De officio Inquisitionis* (Cremona: Apud Jo. B. Belpierum, 1655), which appeared together with his *Praxis inquisitorum*. He prepared annotations for the *Tractatus de haeresi* of Ambrogio Vignati, the *Allegatio in materia haeresis* of Juan López de Palacios Rubios and the *Tractatus de haereticis et eorum poenis* of Paolo Grillando, published together

50 Cf. Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*.

51 Cf. Thomas Scharff, 'Schrift zur Kontrolle—Kontrolle der Schrift. Italienische und französische Inquisitoren-Handbücher des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 52 (1996), 547–584.

52 Cf. Fragnito, 'Aspetti e problemi', 168 at n. 25. The letter dates from 23 July 1599.

53 Cf. Bonardo, Appendix, doc. 2.2.

in one volume (Rome: Giuseppe Ferrari, 1581). He contributed to an edition of *Singularia iuris in favorem fidei, haeresisque detestationem, Tractatus de haereticis, cum quinquaginta analyticis assertionibus. Et privilegiis inquisitorum*, which contains his annotations, and *Quaestionibus 25 coram iudicibus fisci sanctae Inquisitionis controverti solitis* by Gabriele a Quemada (Venice: Francesco Ziletti, 1583). Peña looked after a new edition of the *Lucerna inquisitorum* and *Tractatus de strigis* by Inquisitor Bernardo Rategno of Como, which contains his comments (Rome: Ex officina Bartholomaei Grassi, 1584) and the *Tractatus de protestatione circa materiam fidei* and *De signis pertinaciae haereticae pravitatis* of Jean Gerson.[54]

More new manuals appeared following the 1570s.[55] Bishop Juan Bautista Cardona's *De expungendis haereticorum propriis nominibus etiam de libris qui de religione ex professo non tractant* (Rome: Giuseppe de Angelis, 1576) concentrated on the expurgation of heretics' names. Cardinal Arcangelo de' Bianchi, a member of the Congregation for the Index, compiled *De libris expurgatis et expurgandis tum et noxiis proscribendi volumina tria*. The Capuchin friar Gregory of Naples, a member of the diocesan deputation for the correction of books, published the *Enchiridion sive praeparatio, quae pertinet ad sacramentum poenitentiae et ordinis sacri* (Naples: Presso gli eredi di Mattia Cancer, 1585). The most significant publication in this field was, according to Ugo Rozzo, Antonio Possevino's *Coltura degl'ingegni* (Vicenza: Giorgio Greco, 1598), a translation of the first book of his *Bibliotheca selecta*.[56]

To conclude, an examination of emerging and developing censorship practices reveals a trend towards new manuals, indicating a lack of censorial regulations.[57] It could also have been a symptom of the refinement and specialization of censorship practice, theory and, as a consequence, literature, as a result of changing circumstances. Without such literature and knowledge, even an official guideline such as the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum* could hardly have been of benefit to censors. Its instructions, destined for publication and a public audience, were carefully chosen. They are so brief that their application would hardly have been possible without sound background knowledge of theology and canon law.

The idea of publishing the Clementine *Instructio* seems to have stemmed from a document prepared under Pope Sixtus V, the *Modus, et ratio, vel cor-*

54 Cf. *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, entry 'Peña, Francisco'.

55 See Fragnito, 'Aspetti e problemi', 167–8.

56 Cf. Rozzo, *La Letteratura italiana*, 75–6.

57 Cf. Silvana Seidel Menchi, 'Sette modi di censurare Erasmo', in Rozzo, *La censura libraria*, 177–206.

rigendi libri of 1587.[58] Until now the Sistine *Modus* has received very little attention from critics, but it might be useful to examine it in the context of understanding Clementine censorship policy. Both the Sistine and Clementine documents are novel in that they contain clearly laid out instructions on formal, organizational aspects of expurgation for the purpose of sharing the information with the public and making the policy mandatory. But from a distance it seems to have been a utopian project, the purpose of which was to compose a comprehensive guideline on how to judge an indefinite number of unknown individual ideas expressed in innumerable modes and various sorts of text in the vast frame of a system of belief as developed and complex as the Catholic faith.

58 See Appendix, doc. 2.1.

CHAPTER 4

Censures of the Marvelous

> Petrarca: Dio ti salvi, o Maripetro.
> Maripetro: Anchora salvi te il sommo Dio. Et chi sei tu che così infallibilmente m'hai conosciuto, non essendo io mai più stato in queste contrade? Sei tu forse spirito fantastico, o pur huomo vero?
>
> *Il Petrarca spirituale, 1536*

> Ea quoque aboleantur,
> quae paganismum redolent.
>
> *Instructio de correctione librorum, Index*, 1596

4.1 A Prohibition of Wonders?

How did censors deal with elements of superstition in works containing elements of the poetic 'marvelous', while in 'real' life witches were being persecuted, imprisoned, or, in some parts of Europe, burnt?

Superstitious practices were prohibited by the Roman *Indexes*, as were superstitious elements in books, which generated various questions: could witches be depicted in poetry, and if so, in what manner? As Catholics were expected to believe in demons, and the Roman Church published official manuals on exorcism, how could demons be depicted in poetry? What about ghosts and wonders? Is the thesis true that the Roman *Index* prohibited the depiction of wonders in poetry? There are several other questions which cannot be approached here. An examination of the censorship of superstitious elements in poetry brings to light delicate intersections between reality and poetry. Censors had to come to terms with depictions of superstition in poetry on the one hand, and increasing superstition 'outside' the book, in daily life, on the other hand.

The literary rendering of the 'marvelous' ('meraviglioso') encompassed a wide range of poetic material and was one of the most discussed topics in Counter-Reformation censorship. Censorship files dealt with elements which constituted the 'poetic marvelous' because marvels and wonders played important roles in Catholic faith and life as well. The poetic marvelous had a particular relationship to the Catholic faith, so an examination of poetic ideas

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_005

on the marvelous may serve to better explain censorship, such as the ideas of Bishop Antonio Sebastiano Minturno's *L'Arte poetica*.

Marvel, Minturno says, is achieved through the narration of events that happen beyond our expectations ("che oltra alla nostra openione accadeno"). The effect can be increased if the occurrences are connected logically ("dove elle sì attamente sien congiunte, che l'uno paia dopo l'altra ragionevolmente seguire") rather than coincidentally ("a caso o per fortuna"). Coincidences ought to be perceived as being due to divine intervention ("divino consiglio") or their own motivation ("di lor proprio movimento").[1] Minturno's concept of the marvelous was based on his concept of verisimilitude (*verosimiglianza* or *verisimilitudine*). He explains that a story seems probable ("verisimil") if it corresponds to actual people, times, places and causes; that is, if it resembles the truth. The poet must endeavor to make the listener or reader believe fiction as though it were truth, and marvel.

> Verisimil sarà la narratione, se quelle cose, che si narrano alle persone, a' tempi, a' luoghi, alle cagioni corrisponderanno: se le cose paranno esser dette, come fu possibile o necessario o simile al vero, che quelle avvenissero. Conciosia cosa che studiarci debbiamo di far, che l'auditore non meno il vero, che'l finto creda et habbia in meraviglia.[2]

Minturno was aware that the intention behind arousing marvel was to delight and that poets shaped poetic action to render it believable. He therefore accepted that poets often lied in order to make sense of their stories.[3]

This view was not shared among all the Counter-Reformation censors examined here. Poetic lies and the boundaries they transgressed between the sacred and the profane often challenged censorship. A vivid example is found in the boundaries drawn between Catholicism and heterodox or pagan cults, for the suppression of superstitious beliefs was an important aim of the Counter-Reformation. We know that one means of realizing this aim was through the use of the *Index*, which prohibited descriptions of various kinds

1 Antonio Sebastiano Minturno, *L'Arte poetica* (Venice: Giovanni Andrea Valvassori, 1564, facs. edn., Munich: Fink, 1971), 40.

2 Cf. Minturno, 22, cf. Francesco Sberlati, *Il genere e la disputa, La poetica tra Ariosto e Tasso* (Rome: Bulzoni, 2001), 214, F. Robortello, *In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes. Paraphrases in librum Horatii, qui vulgo de arte poetica ad Pisones inscribitur* (Florence: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1548, facs. edn., Munich: Fink, 1968), 87. Cf. Minturno's criticism of the romanzo genre, op. cit and on *verosimiglianza*, ibid. 22.

3 Ibid. 41–2 and 22.

of superstitious practices in all texts, regardless of literary genre. Theoretically as well as practically, this prohibition included poetry; that is, fiction or poets' 'lies'. Again and again poetic works were censored or expurgated (but not necessarily printed in an expurgated version) because of superstitious elements. Among such works was the *Orlando furioso*, which was once again permitted to be printed in Rome at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Before that time, the printing, publication, selling and possession of this and similar works had been subject to conditions determined by the censorial authorities.

Since the first promulgation of the *Index* in 1558/59, this policy had been formulated as a general prohibition based on the *libri omnes* principle and introduced in the *Index* of Trent as *Rule* IX in 1564. The law banned all books, printed or handwritten, that were dedicated to any of the divinatory arts, such as geomancy, hydromancy, aeromancy, pyromancy, onomancy, chiromancy or necromancy that contained ("continentur") sortilege, recipes for poison, augury, auspices or enchantments of black magic. Baldini explains that *Rule* IX was understood to concern only predictions claimed to be certain and true because they "implied the necessity of voluntary human acts."[4] The law ordained bishops to ensure that nobody read or possessed books, indexes or treatises on judicial astrology that affirmed future events, fortuitous occurrences or other actions that depended on human will. By contrast, unlike judicial astrology, judgments and observations of natural phenomena composed for marine navigation, agriculture and medicine were permitted.[5] As a general prohibition this law did not require a text to be explicitly mentioned in the *Index*; it concerned all texts described (the *libri omnes* principle).[6]

The spectrum of proscribed superstitious practices was indeed vast. What is important here is that the rejection of superstition was not at all new to the Roman Church but had been expressed long since, even in Sacred Scripture (Deut. 18:11–12, Exod. 22:18, 1 Sam. 28, Lev. 20: 27, Gal. 5:20, Rev. 21:8, 22:15, Acts 8:9, 13:6, Exod. 20:2–5) and therefore in canon law. Rejection of superstition has always been a component of Christianity. Theological debate over the divinatory and magic arts can be found in patristic literature, and ecclesiastical

4 Cf. Ugo Baldini, 'The Roman Inquisition's condemnation of astrology: antecedents, reasons, and consequences', in Fragnito (ed.), *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 80–110, 90 and *Observatio* to *Regula* IX, *Index* of 1596, in *ILI*, ix.

5 Cf. Baldini, 90 and 82.

6 Cf. Silvio Antoniano's suggestion to prohibit explicitly *libri geomantiae* in the year 1594, in *Oppositiones a S.D.N. per Illustrissimum Dominum Silvium Antonianum transmissae contra Indicem*, read on 12 February 1594 at Congregation for the Index, published in Frajese, 'La politica dell'Indice dal Tridentino al Clementino (1571–1596)', *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà*, XI (1998), 269–356, 347.

attempts to prohibit them had already been made by councils of the early Christian Church, as seen in the *Decretum Gratiani*.[7] Papal bulls repeatedly sought to remind Christians of this legislation, and books on the magic and divinatory arts were banned by Pope John XXII in 1326.[8] The persecution of the divinatory arts and books on the subject was not, however, instigated by the Christian Church; it had its roots in Roman law.[9]

The Counter-Reformation desire to suppress forms of superstitious beliefs and practices is also clearly expressed in *Rule* VIII of the same *Index*. *Rule* VIII ordains that books by good authors ("boni auctores") could be permitted if passages describing heresy, impiety, divination or superstition were cleansed.[10] In 1596, the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum* picked up on this policy. Elements suspected of superstition, sorcery, divination, paganism, the subjugation of human actions to fate or similar pagan forces were to be deleted because human action was believed to depend on human reason and will.[11]

Since *Rule* IX applied to many types of printed or handwritten texts ("libri omnes et scripta"), the reasons for rejecting superstition must be clarified in order to better understand the censorship of fictional poetry. In addition to the marvelous, other poetic themes were linked to superstition such as love and criticism of the religious; for instance, the above-mentioned divinatory, magic and occult arts involved idolatry, as the two inquisitors Bernardo of Como and

---

7 On superstition, see e.g. Augustine, in *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. A. Friedberg (2nd edn., Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1879), C. 26 q. 5 (hereafter *DG*), cf C. 28 q. I. c. 5. Cf. Concilium Laodicenum, 4th century, in Johannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence: Antonio Zatta, 1759) ii, 569. Sixteenth-century files of inquisitorial trials confirm that the accusation of black magic often went hand in hand with the accusation of idolatry, cf. Dublin, TCD, MS 1225; see also Alexander of Hales, *Summa universae theologiae* (Pavia: Giovanni Antonio Beretta and Francesco Girardengo, 1489), Inq. III, tract. VIII, sect. I, quaest. I, tit. 1: *De idololatria*, ch. I, art. II. Furthermore, Bernardo of Como, 119 and 33, on idolatry also Eymerich/Peña, Q. 42 c. 68/341–3. On the term 'daemon', ibid., 343. Pope John XXII, *Extravagans contra Magos, magicasque superstitiones*, ibid. 341–2. In 1596 the ninth Rule was changed, pagan texts about judicial astrology were permitted and only texts by Christian authors should be purged, see Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. S, 517r–22r, 'De expurgatione librorum'.

8 On measures against books on magic and superstition in the Middle Ages, see Heinrich Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Literaturgeschichte* (Bonn: Cohen, 1883), i, 22–3. For the bull of John XXII, dating from 1326, see *Bullarium diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum*, ed. Francisco Gaude (Turin: Franco, Fory and Dalmazzo, 1859), iv, 315.

9 Cf. Julius Paulus, *Libri sententiarum*, in *Titi Gaii Institutionum Iuliique Pauli Sententiarum* (Paris: Via ad divum Iacobum, 1525), l. 5, tit. 24.

10 *R* VIII, *Index* of 1564.

11 See *Index* of 1596 (also the earlier version of 1593).

Eymerich, the lawyer Paolo Grillando and Bishop Diego Simancas explain on the basis of Sacred Scripture and sources of canon law.[12] Idolatry was said to become manifest in the adoration of demons, pagan forces, idols and deities, for instance. It was believed to originate in Satan's influence and Satan was believed to be an actual spiritual being who used idolatry to lead Christians astray and trap them in covenants with demons, as described by Augustine.[13] Simancas explains that whoever makes sacrifices to idols or pays divine honor to them is to be judged a heretic and, based on the Sacred Scripture, idolaters were to be punished by death according to the divine law of the Old Testament.[14]

Another example of the intersection of 'real' life with poetry in censorship practice can be seen in the question of the sublimation or deification of female characters in love poetry. Censors were able to associate a poet's expression of adoration for a woman with idolatry, as I will show later. It raised the question of how a poet wished his adoration to be understood and what effect this form of idolatry would have on readers. In addition, the belief in supernatural pagan beings and forces was not only considered a danger because it entailed idolatry; it was also a threat because the concept of such beings having the power to dominate human will and action did not conform to the Catholic faith, as can be seen from *Rule* IX.

It is easy to see that *Rule* IX must have impacted heavily on literature, but its impact on poetry has not yet been examined; in fact, it has barely been discussed in literary studies. In addition, the issue is more complex than it first appears. The thesis has been put forward that the Council of Trent passed a radical "prohibition of wonders" ("Wunderverbot") with *Rule* IX. Identifying a relationship between the law and contemporary poetic creation, Irmgard Scharold maintains that the elimination of the marvelous in poetry became

12 Cf. Bernardo of Como, 116, Eymerich and Peña, c. XXXIV, Paolo Grillando, *Tractatus de hereticis et sortilegis omnifariam coitu eorumque penis* (Lyons: Giacomo Giunti, 1545), ii, Simancas, tit. 21.

13 Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana libri quattuor*, in id., *Opera*, sect. VI, pars VI, recensuit et praefatus est Guilelmus M. Green (Vienna: Hoelder, Pichler, Tempsky, 1963), II, XX, 30, 74 and XXII, 36, 89, Eymerich and Peña, Q. 29/317, also ibid. c. 54. Cf. Jakob Springer and Heinrich Institoris, *Der Hexenhammer*, trans. J.W.R. Schmidt (Erftstadt: Area, 2005), 5, they refer to Thomas Aquinas's *Summa contra gentiles*, Augustine's *De civitate Dei* and *De doctrina Christiana* as well as commentaries on Exod. 7. One should remember that the Roman Church published the *Rituale Romanum* prepared by General-Inquisitor Giulio Antonio Santori under Pope Gregory XIII.

14 Cf. Simancas, tit. 32 / 247, he quotes Exod. 22:20, Deut. 17:2–5.

an official act by means of this law.[15] However, the files of the Roman censorial authorities, Roman Inquisition and Congregation for the Index offer no proof of a radical and absolute prohibition of wonders in poetry. Also, as shown above, the prohibition of magic and divinatory arts as well as books dealing with them had been expressed much earlier. *Rule* IX, therefore, was neither the result of a decree first issued by the Council of Trent nor a new prohibition; like many other inquisitorial and censorial measures of the sixteenth century, it simply followed tradition, canon law, the Sacred Scripture and Roman law. And a slightly different version of the general law *Rule* IX figures already in the previous Roman *Indexes*.[16]

Instead of concentrating on the suppression of books containing superstitious material, it is time to go further by asking how the general prohibition was meant to be applied and understood in the field of poetry. In this way, its impact on poetic composition and theory can be identified and understood more clearly. Therefore, it is necessary to take a closer look at the documents.[17]

To begin with, I would like to introduce a brief observation on the *romanzo* genre made by Fra Paolo Filippi from Perugia in July 1595 and received by the Dominican Fra Paolo Pico, *Sacrae Theologiae Professor* and secretary to the Congregation for the Index. Fra Paolo Filippi explains that in the Spanish *romanzo Amadis di Grecia* by Feliciano de Silva he had found "enchantments" which, with regard to the faith, had annoyed him. In his view, such enchantments could only be classified as "miraculous" ("miracolose") and "fantasies" ("fantasticherie") from the Catholic and demonological point of view. He points out that such supernatural phenomena could give the impression that the devil had such power and knowledge. Although he states that "fantastic" inventions could be excused as such, he deems them a great danger to unlearned readers.

Fra Paolo refers to the entire genre of Spanish books of chivalry. The *Amadis* is only one example of the type of books ("questi Romanzi spagnuoli," "questi libri") which were so common that they had blinded the eyes, hearts and

15 Cf. Irmgard Scharold, *Vom Wunderbaren zum Phantas(ma)tischen: Zur Archäologie vormoderner Phantastik-Konzeptionen bei Ariost und Tasso* (Munich: Fink, 2012), 47.

16 See *Indexes* 1557–1564, in *ILI*, viii.

17 On the terms *maraviglia* and *maraviglioso* cf. Karl-Heinz Stahl, *Das Wunderbare als Problem und Gegenstand der deutschen Poetik des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/Main: Athenaion, 1975), in particular 6ss. Also Christel Meier, ' "Ut rebus apta sint verba." Überlegungen zu einer Poetik des Wunderbaren im Mittelalter', in Dietrich Schmidtke (ed.), *Das Wunderbare in der mittelalterlichen Literatur* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1994), 37–83, 37.

fantasies of the nuns. He deems them to be as perilous as Ariosto's *Furioso* and points out that the nuns preferred to read them over the *Furioso* because they felt embarrassed by the "descriptions" in the latter, by which he was apparently referring to lascivious elements and scenes. He expresses his hope that the Congregation for the Index would find a suitable "remedy" against such descriptions, implying restrictive measures against, if not the suppression of an entire genre. In fact, as early as 1571 the Spanish books of chivalry had attracted the attention of another religious personality soon to become a censor. Paleotti included the *Amadis de Gaula* in a blacklist of books that he sent to Sirleto.[18]

Fra Paolo did not indicate which edition he had read but, since Italian vernacular translations of the poem were published in Italy, it may well have been an Italian vernacular translation.

> Il Punto è che ho trovato leggendo a questi dì . . . in uno di questi Romanzi spagnuoli, Amadis di Grecia, certe cose, che quanto alla fede m'hanno dato fastidio. Cioè che finge un Incanto, nel quale si veggono i secreti del cuore et altri dove si fanno cose che non possono essere se non miracolose e consequentemente che il demonio habbia tal' virtù e cognitione . . . se bene si scusano queste fantasticherie come fantasticherie, nondimeno sono a semplici di grandissimo pericolo. Nè forse è senza gran danno, che questi libri siano tanto vulgati, che hanno occupato gl'occhi, per non dir i cuori e fantasie fin delle monache, che forse più o almeno non meno degl'altri secolari gli leggono. Non ho voluto scriverne ad altri: perchè Reverendo potrà di già sapere quanto di rimedio intorno a questo sperare et operare si possa. Certo credo non meno nuochino questi che il *Furioso* alle monache le quali del *Furioso* si vergognano per le sue descrizioni, di questi no, se ben v'è l'equalente o peggio. Intanto stia sana, e diaci qualche aviso del Maestro Matoncino, di Napoli, della nostra Minerva, di Francia, Hungaria o di qualche altra cosa. Dio la contenti. Di Perugia, li X. di luglio 1595.[19]

18 Cf. Fragnito, 'Li libbri non zò rrobba da cristiano: la letteratura italiana e l'indice di Clemente VIII (1596)', *Schifanoia: notizie dell'Istituto di Studi Rinascimentali di Ferrara*, 19 (1999), 123–35, 125–6.

19 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. O, 573v, letter by Fra Paolo Filippi to the secretary of the Congregation for the Index, Paolo Pico (in Santa Maria sopra Minerva), of the year 1595 (italics are mine).

Why did Fra Paolo consider the representation of such enchantments to be dangerous? He refers to the representation of a kind of supernatural deed or 'wonder' that he believed could only have been produced by demons, and it was there that he sensed danger. His Catholicism distinguished between good and evil supernatural operations; according to canon law, the good supernatural deed was to be understood as God's intervention in earthly life. Such deeds were called "miracles" ("miraculi"), and the capability to perform miracles was held to be a gift from the Holy Ghost.[20]

Evil supernatural wonders or deeds ("mira"), however, were said to be produced by or through evil people who had the power to perform them. They could be subdivided into two main forms: a real action committed by a person with demonic support and divine consent, or an illusion produced through an enchantment of the senses, again by demonic influence, as explained in a decree by Pope Gregory IX and fifteenth- and sixteenth-century treatises.[21] Marvelous deeds originating from demonic influences were also referred to as "mirabili et stupende operationi," as in the title of Girolamo Menghi's treatise *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica et possibilità delle mirabili et stupende operationi delli demoni et dei malefici*.

Because of the dangers inherent in the *mira*, Christians were to believe only in divine wonders. These wonders were to be understood as signs of God's greatness, and to be officially acknowledged by the Roman Church and admired.[22] This is one reason why the poetic treatment of such material in profane texts was restricted and controlled. Yet from the censorial perspective it could be judged a profanation and abuse to use Christian miracles instead of pagan *mira* or to combine pagan and Christian tales of wonders in order to sublimate profane poetry.

It was the demonic wonders, or *mira*, that Fra Paolo found depicted in the *Amadis de Grecia* and that he refers to as "fantasies" ("fantasticherie"). He understood them to be illusions or deceptions, and therefore dangerous. He found depictions of powerful demonic work and seduction which he did

20 Springer and Institoris, 8.

21 See D. Quaglioni, 'I miracoli tra teologia e diritto', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, 42/3 (2006), 459–505, 498 and 500, id., 'La prova del miracolo. Spunti dalla dottrina di diritto commune', in *Notai, miracoli e culto dei santi. Pubblicità e autenticazione del sacro tra XII e XV secolo*, Atti del seminario internazionale (Roma, 5–7 dicembre 2002), ed. R. Michetti (Milan: Giuffré, 2004), 97–114, cf. the entry 'Miracula' in *Wortkonkordanz zum Decretum Gratiani*, ed. Timothy Reuter and Gabriel Silagi (Munich: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1990), 2806.

22 See Quaglioni, 'La prova del miracolo', 109.

not believe conformed to the Catholic faith. As the poem provides no explanation, Fra Paolo evidently feared that such depictions could create superstitious ideas with regard to the faith among readers who were unable to comprehend the inherent danger, particularly nuns.

Reflections and doubts of this and other censors about the marvelous material recall contemporary poetological debates. One aspect of importance to censors was the depiction of what they believed and understood to be true and real in relation to what was invented. They were concerned about the oppositions of truth and untruth, reality and fiction. That is not to say that the narrated story had to be true, but it was expected to seem possible and credible from the perspective of the Catholic faith, as I will show. From the poetological point of view, this approach recalls the principle of verisimilitude. For this reason, Bishop Minturno combined marvel and verisimilitude in his poetics. Even though the word *verosimiglianza* is not used in the consulted censorship documents, the crucial question of whether the story was possible and credible according to the Catholic faith was always present and close to Minturno's definition of *verosimiglianza*.

Criticism such as that put forward by Fra Paolo can also be found in other judgments on profane vernacular poetry in which representations of various kinds of wonders attracted the censors' attention. The censors whose judgments have been handed down to us did not consciously deal with the marvelous as a poetic phenomenon; nevertheless, their approach was quite complex, and they shared doubts similar to those of Fra Paolo. They, too, identified passages describing supernatural actions that could not have taken place through human power without the intervention of God or supernatural forces. They likewise approached marvelous elements from the Catholic point of view according to their understanding of 'reality' in order to verify whether the elements were compatible with the Catholic faith. They perceived such elements as part of a poetical text, taking into account that a poet might have wished them to be understood as fictional. At the same time they made it clear that the reception of the marvelous by a heterogeneous readership (learned, unlearned, clerical, religious, and lay) was a criterion of censorship. This criterion shaped their expectations of poetry and the practice of censorship informed poetic aesthetics that coincided with Counter-Reformation aesthetics.

In the 1590s, the *Orlando Furioso* was repeatedly discussed at the Congregation for the Index due to its design of the marvelous. After Tommaso Galletti, a priest and member of the Oratorio di San Filippo Neri, denounced the work to the Congregation in 1597, he provided them with elaborate censorships of the *Furioso* and *Cinque canti*; as a result, the Congregation entrusted

the Inquisition of Ferrara with the expurgation of the *romanzo*.[23] In his assessment of the *Furioso*, Galletti deals, among other things, with wonders similar to Christian miracles and marvelous illusions, very typical of this poem, which could be regarded as *mira*. Galletti presents only a small selection of passages, possibly due to the complexity and length of the work as well as to the fact that at the time the form of the *censura* was not defined as a text genre.[24] With this in mind, the significance of the following examples chosen by Galletti may become clearer.

First of all, Galletti's censorship of wonders is not only concerned with the fact that Christian material was used in a profane text and that the sacred and profane were mingled; his criticism goes beyond that. He was rather concerned about how the religious material was used; that is to say, the way in which wonders were depicted. One example is offered in the transformation scene in canto 39: The English knight Astolfo throws branches into the sea at the coast of Bizerta, and these branches turn into a fleet (*OF* 39.26–8). Astolfo is neither an enchanter nor a wizard, nor is he gifted with natural magic powers. A censor such as Galletti, endeavoring to explain the transformation of the branches from the Catholic perspective, was inclined to recognize the idea of God's intervention and to consider it a miracle or a miraculous phenomenon.

Here, in fact, Ariosto helps his reader by providing a hint as to how the transformation should be understood by referring to it as a "miracle" ("stupendo miracolo," *OF* 39.26.7). Galletti picks up on this explanation, understanding that the concept of the divine miracle had been employed in order to invent a new one for a profane story. He defines the miracle as fiction, an invention of the poet ("finti miracoli") which he is unwilling to accept. He therefore recommends its elimination:

> Dal canto 39 parmi che si devino lievar quelle stanze nelle quali trattasi di finti miracoli, comincia la diceria da quei due versi della 26 stanza: O stupendo miracolo, che nacque / di quelle frondi, come fur nell'acque sino a quelli altri: Miracol fu vedere le frondi sparte [*OF* 28.1].
> Nella stanza 78 del medesmo canto, che comincia: Ma il suo fiero destin, et tolgansi quei due versetti:
> Vuol che l'armata che nacque di fronde / miracolosamente ne la spiaggia (*OF* 39.78.3–4)[25]

23 On the case of *Orlando furioso* and *Cinque canti* see Appendix, doc. 1.4–5.

24 See Editorial Notes.

25 See Appendix, doc. 1.4d.

A further miraculous action is examined in the story of King Rodomonte, who uses a cruel method to get rid of a hermit. Galletti observes that an invented miracle is narrated ("conta miracol finto") in canto 29 (stanza 7), but makes no suggestion as to whether the passage ought to be corrected. In view of his judgment of the previous narration, he might have hoped for the same treatment in this case, and his suggestion of expurgation might be implicit. He also insists on the elimination of the improper adjective "garrulous" ("garrulo") used by the poet to describe the hermit in the subsequent stanza 8:

> Nel canto 29 nella stanza 7 (= 8) conta miracol finto sopra lo scampo dell'eremita che Rodomonte si spiciò da lato, non è da tolerar quel verso della seguente stanza:
> S'hebbe da canto il garrulo eremita (*OF* 29.8.2)
> Scioccamente chiamando, il mantenitore della castità efficace: garrulo.[26]

In stanzas 7 and 8 the poet narrates that King Rodomonte, who is in love with Isabella and can no longer bear to hear the hermit preach, decides to get rid of the hermit by hurling him through the air towards the sea. The poet presents different versions of what subsequently happens to the hermit; one version suggests that the hermit falls into the sea, is rescued by a saint and dragged aground. It is most likely that this version caught Galletti's attention, as he refers to an invented miracle. This time the word "miracle" is not being used by Ariosto, as in the earlier scene of the transformation of the branches. Galletti's use of "miracle" shows that he interpreted the story of the hermit as being inspired by Christian stories of miracles. His interpretation introduces another aspect of his approach to poetry because he reflects on the poet's motivation behind the usage of the word "miracle" and the narrative structure of a miracle.

Sublimation of profane poetry through imitation of the sacred comes into play as another aspect worthy of censorial attention. Galletti explicitly states that the word "miracolo" and its adjectival derivations were often used to describe "attioni molto basse". Galletti explains that Ariosto used the word as an epithet in "materia di prove donnesche" when he wrote that Ruggiero would perform marvelous things out of love for Bradamante:

> Quantumque molti vulgari congionghino quella voce: di miracolo e miracoloso, a esse e attioni molto basse, parmi che non si deva usare tale epiteto Dal Poeta in materia di prove donnesche, come in quel verso:

26 Ibid. doc. 1.4c.

> Nei secoli avenir miracolose. Parla di Bradamente stanza 2 canto 26. (*OF* 26.2.8)[27]

Galletti understands the poet's intention behind the imitation of miracles: Ariosto used the Christian miracle not only as a model for an action to impress the reader, but also to sublimate a profane action which Galletti considers less worthy than a sacred one, and eventually to sublimate his profane poem. Galletti does not approve of this use of the Christian miracle, presumably because he considers it an abuse. All the examples of profane miracles presented in his censorship seem to serve as illustrations of this observation that addressed an important point from the censorial point of view. It brings to mind the Tridentine decree *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* that prohibited the abuse of words and phrases of the Sacred Scripture in profane texts and the general prohibition expressed in the unpromulgated *Index* of 1557.

Further examples of magic and witchcraft examined by Galletti include the enchantment of the English knight Astolfo performed by Alcina. Astolfo was transformed into a myrtle bush, and the poet maintains that this story is true (*OF* 7.1–2): Ruggiero flies on a hippogriff to Alcina's island. He ties the winged horse to a myrtle bush which introduces itself as Paladin Astolfo, son of the King of England. Astolfo explains how Alcina seduced him and then transformed him into a myrtle bush (*OF* 6.31–7.52). Such a destiny, Astolfo explains, awaits all Acina's lovers to prevent them from talking about her lascivious life:

> E perché essi non vadano pel mondo
> di lei narrando la vita lasciva,
> chi qua chi là, per lo terren fecondo
> li muta, altri in abete, altri in oliva,
> altri in palma, altri in cedro, altri secondo
> che vedi me su questa verde riva,
> altri in liquido fonte, alcuni in fiera,
> come più agrada a quella fata altiera.
>
> Or tu che sei per non usata via,
> signor, venuto all'isola fatale,
> acciò ch'alcuno amante per te sia
> converso in pietra o in onda, o fatto tale;
> avrai d'Alcina scettro e signoria,
> e sarai lieto sopra ogni mortale:

27 Ibid.

> ma certo sii di giunger tosto al passo
> d'entrar o in fiera o in fonte o in legno o in sasso. (*OF* 6.51–2)

Evidently Galletti was concerned with the reader's orthodoxy. He expresses his fear that an untrue and distorted representation of witchcraft could influence the beliefs of readers:

> Nel canto sesto ove si favella di Astolfo transformato in mirto, parmi di avvertire che se la metamorfosi de gentili si tolerano, non si devono sofferire quelle che fingono i Poeti Christiani, massime per non fomentare una vana opinione del vulgo, il quale tal volta ha creduto che le streghe habbino possanza di transformar le creature ragionevoli in varie sorti d'animali.[28]

Galletti does not deny the existence of witches, but he does deny their capability to transform humans into animals. It was important to him to emphasize the danger of such narrations, so he censored the account of Alcina's transformations of knights in *Cinque canti* and recommended that the related verses be deleted:

> Nel canto quarto alla stanza quarentesima parlasi delle mutationi fatte da Alcina, in questa guisa:
> [In India vedut'hai la quantitade]
> Delle conversion che questa ria
> ha fatto in fiere, in fonti, in sassi, in piante,
> de i cavallier, di ch'ella è stata amante. (*CC* 4.40.6–8)
> Perciò giudico s'habbino da tuor via, sì come i due primi della sequente stanza.
> Quei che, per nuovi successor, men cari
> Le vengono, muta ella in varie forme . . . (*CC* 4.41.1–2)[29]

It becomes clear that the manner in which superstition was introduced into profane poetry was decisive in Galletti's censorship: "parlasi . . . in questa guisa." In the story the transformations are depicted as though they truly happened, a crucial element of the narrative structure. This posed a problem for Galletti because he did not accept poetry confirming the truth of what would be defined as deception by the Catholic faith. He went so far as to censor an

28 Ibid.

29 See Appendix, doc. 1.4e.

invented story, told by one of the characters, of Ricciardetto's transformation by a nymph (*OF* 25.62–69).

In the story, Ricciardetto tells Ruggiero of how he deceived Fiordespina in order to seduce her. His sister Bradamante, dressed as a knight, encountered Fiordespina, who mistook her for a man and fell in love with her. When Bradamante tells Ricciardetto of this misunderstanding, he sees an opportunity to seduce Fiordespina. Ricciardetto dresses in his sister's clothes, meets Fiordespina and tells her the story of his transformation: In character as 'Bradamante,' he encounters a nymph and frees her from a fishing net. The nymph transforms 'her' into a man. Ricciardetto's plan is successful; he seduces Fiordespina, and what follows is described in detail as an "amoroso assalto" (*OF* 25.68.2–69).

Galletti's rigorous assessment aimed to suppress Ricciardetto's story (*OF* 25.62–69). Eight stanzas were classed as "impious" ("empie") and "profane" ("profane"), and no alternative was provided.[30] These stanzas could have been censored on the grounds of immorality due to the "amoroso assalto"; Galletti, however, focused on the transformation of the sex ("metamorphose di sexo"). Aside from the homoerotic implication, it is possible to find the primary reason for this censorship in the poetic treatment of magic. It is clear that Ricciardetto invented the story, so one might rightly ask why it was subject to censorship. The key point is that the story failed to make clear that the nymph's supernatural power was invented. Galletti's approach to the marvelous was similar to that of Fra Paolo, but he went further by reflecting upon and drawing attention to motives of Ariosto and poets in general by using material from history and the Catholic faith. Galletti's criticism addresses aspects that were also crucial for Torquato Tasso's revision of his epic poem *Gerusalemme Liberata*, which I will briefly discuss.

In the revision of *Gerusalemme liberata*, Tasso discusses the depiction of supernatural elements with Silvio Antoniano, one of his revisors. It is important to note that Antoniano was not only familiar with poetry but held various posts at the Roman court and was, like his friend Agostino Cardinal Valier, a member of the Vatican Academy.[31] Tasso consented to the elimination of

30 Ibid. doc. 1.4c, also *OF* 25.61–4 and 26.128.

31 Antoniano's name as a member of the Vatican Academy was *il Risoluto necnon il Poetino*. At the Roman court he worked at the Segretaria Apostolica, was appointed teacher at the Sapienza in 1563 by Pius IV, and became secretary of the Collegio Cardinalizio under Pius V. He was strongly influenced by Carlo Borromeo, who was a nephew of Pius IV and a friend of Valier. He authored the *Educazione cristiana dei figliuoli* that was published in 1584, one year before Tasso's *Apologia in difesa della Gerusalemme liberata* appeared,

the transformation of knights into fish—effected by the enchantress Armida, recalling the transformation of the knights in the *Furioso*—the miracle of the tomb, Rinaldo's vision and the transformation of the eagle, yet he insisted on defending his poetic freedom regarding the composition of other marvelous elements such as enchantments ("incanti") and wonders ("meraviglia") taken from other stories.[32]

A few years later in his *Apologia della Gerusalemme liberata*, which first appeared in Ferrara in 1585, Tasso again reflected upon the marvelous. Critics have pointed out that the influence of Catholic demonology is evident in his poetic thought, explained by his religious scruples and fears as well as by his tutoring by strict supporters of the Counter-Reformation, such as Antoniano. It is important to mention that Tasso distinguished between two kinds of poetry: the composition of images through the imitation of "true things" ("cose vere"), and the composition of phantasms ("farà i fantasmi"), things that do not exist ("cose che non sono").

In his discussion of Ariosto's marvelous material, Tasso accepts Ariosto's poetry as "fantastic" ("fantastica"), as suggested by the French poet Pierre Ronsard. He gives three examples of creatures that Ariosto introduced into the *Furioso* and that had not been written or described before: the hippogriff, the monsters which try to prevent Ruggiero from entering Logistilla's realm and Malagigi's monstrous bird, which frightened the steer Baiardo while Rinaldo and Gradasso were fighting over him.[33] His idea of "fantastic" poetry was based on the distinction between things that exist and things that do not exist. Things that do not exist are defined as "fantastic" in opposition to things that do exist. The basic idea of these reflections on poetry and fantastic poetry was not new or invented by Tasso.

At that time the Roman Church understood and defined truth and the concept of true existence and fantasy, as the decree *Apostolici regiminis* of the Fifth Lateran Council (1513) shows. This was definitive for Tasso. In his late poetological writings and letters, he presented himself as caught up in

---

and became *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index, cardinal and eventually a member of the same Congregation. Cf. the entry 'Antoniano, Silvio', in *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*; *Noctes Vaticanae*, XX, xxiv and Valier, *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, in *Noctes Vaticanae*, 23, and Valier, *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, ibid., 23, G. Cipriani, *La mente di un inquisitore. Agostino Valier e l'Opusculum De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris* (*1589–1604*) (Florence: Nicomp Saggi, 2008), 134 and 275.

32 See Tasso's letter to Silvio Antoniano of 30 April 1576, in Tasso, *Prose*, ed. Ettore Mazzali (Milan: Ricciardi, 1959), 776.

33 See Tasso, *Apologia in difesa della Gerusalemme liberata*, in id., *Prose*, 431–3.

religious scruples. It is therefore noteworthy that he carefully expressed a warning against dealing with "fantastic" material. He understood there to be potential danger inherent in engaging in it. In his *Apologia*, he explains that by seeking things that apparently do not exist ("cose che non sono") but lie hidden in the dark ("stanno ascose e ricoperte nelle tenebre e nella caligine di quel che non è"), a poet runs the risk of losing himself ("ma ricercandone, è gran pericolo che perda se stesso"). He suggests that a fantastic poet ("poeta fantastico") should follow Dante, whom he refers to as a divine poet, and that a poet should seek things that do not exist in the light and splendor of what truly exists ("più tosto devesse cercarne nella luce e nello splendore di quel che è, come ricercò Dante, poeta divino"). On the basis of Tasso's intense preoccupation with demonological thought, it does not seem out of place to recognize the religious implication that fantastic poets ran the risk of losing themselves in things distant from the Catholic truth and God, and could potentially fall victim to demons.

The definitions of what exists and what does not exist, what is real and what is not real, and where truth begins and ends may have been clearer to Galletti and Fra Paolo than to the laity. Superstition mingled freely with Christian faith. In the view of certain churchmen, mingling was considered not only a danger to individual salvation, but was also regarded as questioning Catholic theology in terms of ontological matters. It was explained by intellectual developments, as one may conclude by reading *Apostolici regiminis* (1513), and by the spread of popular beliefs.

In his *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica*, Girolamo Menghi complains that theology was being accused of lying: Demons are considered mere inventions of theologians, but he does not specify by whom ("fittione ritrovata da' theologi christiani"). In a system in which the belief in demons and afterlife played such an important role for salvation, such doubts represented a danger for those who doubted and did not protect themselves from demonic seduction; their doubts had the potential to spread and infect other Christians.

It is therefore no wonder that Menghi introduced examples of superstitious beliefs in mythological deities which determined destiny, such as the Three Fates. Basing his position on Augustine, he repudiated this belief and explained that it had been derived from poetry. He indirectly suggested that poetry nourished superstition.[34] He observed that theology was put into question when this kind of superstitious belief spread. He seems to have conformed to the ideas of Giustinian and Querini, Fra Paolo and, as I will show below, Tommaso

34 See Menghi, *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica*, 253–5, cf. 5ss.

Galletti. What Menghi feared was increasing success of the devil's work and the diminishing of faith among Catholics.

In contemporary demonology, the question of where truth ended and superstition and fiction began became particularly important in considering whether or not witches existed. What is important for this study is that the existence of witches, as defended by Menghi and the Inquisitor Bernardo of Como, was accepted among the members of the Congregation for the Index, as suggested by Peña's efforts to publish Bernardo's treatise on witches *De strigis*. Peña even added a commentary to the work, in which he affirms Bernardo's position.

Bernardo tried hard to convince his readers of the existence of witches, to refute the idea that they existed only in fantasy and to show that demons could transport witches from one place to another over a long geographical distance. Witches, he explained, were a heretical sect of men and women that had appeared in various parts of the Appenine peninsula many years ago and practiced magical arts with the support of the devil.[35]

In order to understand Bernardo's position, and especially Counter-Reformation censorship, it might be fruitful to distinguish between individuals and their work. The crucial question for Catholics was what witches really could do with their powers and the support of demons. This question was also crucial in the composition of poetry. All writings which propagated false ideas of witchcraft were considered dangerous, as they dealt with a phenomenon that was believed to exist. The measures taken in the field of censorship in sixteenth-century poetry reflect the attempt by the Roman Church to use literature to redefine and shape its concept of 'reality' in order to distinguish it from 'non-reality', fiction and fantasy, as in the distinction between truth and untruth. For this reason we shall take a closer look at how this form of censorship was exercised, taking into account what it meant for the poetic creation of the marvelous.

4.2 The Marvelous, Characters and Action

4.2.1 *Human Characters and Animals with Supernatural Powers*

In order to create a marvelous action, a poet could make use of characters commonly believed to be capable of working miracles and performing spells, not only according to the Christian faith but also to contemporary folk belief.

35 See Bernardo of Como, *De strigis*, in id., *Lucerna inquisitorum*, 141, Peña, *Annotationes in Tractatum de strigis Bernardi Comensis*, 155–9.

The choice and shape of figures in marvelous actions were tightly linked to the action itself, as explained by Aristotle in his *Poetics*. This aspect is significant in Counter-Reformation censorship. Since the censorial assessment of marvelous material focused on the question of how wonders could be explained, it often included an examination of the characters involved. Censors tried to determine why a character was able to work a miracle or perform a marvelous deed in order to determine what kind of power the character possessed, and from where this power originated.

If we examine Galletti's criticism of the overuse or 'abuse' of the word *miracolo* that aims at poetic sublimation, we may recognize that it is pronounced in connection with the depiction of the deeds of the knight Ruggiero:

> Quantumque molti vulgari congionghino quella voce: di miracolo e miracoloso, a esse e attioni molto basse, parmi che non si deva usare tale epiteto Dal Poeta in materia di prove donnesche, come in quel verso:
> Nei secoli avenir miracolose. Parla di Bradamente stanza 28 canto 26. (*OF* 26.2.7–8)

Galletti explicitly concentrates on a linguistic aspect of this depiction, since he defined "miraculous" ("miracolose") as an epithet used to sublimate Ruggiero's deeds and thereby the character himself. Another passage was censored for a similar reason, namely the depiction of King Rodomonte. Rodomonte's power is described as "infinite" ("infinita"). Galletti declares that Ariosto lost his mind ("si mostra fuor di senno"). This censorship affected language and style, but was not about religious language; rather, it sprang from Galletti's idea of the possible and the credible as defined by his idea of 'reality' and faith. Apparently Galletti read this passage literally and did not consider or accept the poetic means of hyperbole:

> Nel medesmo canto ventesimo settimo, l'Ariosto si mostra fuor di senno, parlando della forza di Rodomonte, che si puotrà dire smisurata, ma non infinita, disse nella stanza 79:
> Non era la possanza e la fierezza
> di Rodomonte ancor ch'era infinita (*OF* 27.79.1–2)[36]

Magic characters in particular attracted Galletti's interest, such as Alcina. Galletti censored the transformation of the knight Astolfo by Alcina not only because the scene involved magic, but also because of how Alcina and the

36 See Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

transformation were depicted. Ariosto presented Alcina as a sister of Morgan le Fay and Logistilla (*OF* 6.38.3–4; 6.43.3). In folk belief, fays were said to be endowed with supernatural magic powers by nature, and were therefore also referred to as "maghe." Unlike her sisters, Alcina used her powers to create illusions and deceptions in order to seduce the knights.[37] It was her role in the poem that attracted Galletti's attention, and the way in which she performed magic.

It was also important to consider the religious background of the author, text and reader. Galletti drew attention to the question of how the story and the character of Alcina could be perceived. He accepted that ancient classical poets had narrated transformations but viewed the work of contemporary Christian poets with different eyes. Galletti called to mind that, through the representation of witches and their magical performances, Christian poets could nourish superstitious beliefs concerning the powers of witches, which had once been believed.

This remark presupposes the notion that works by Christian poets were perceived differently than ethnic classical authors, and that readers tended to believe their stories. Consequently, the readers' orthodoxy could have been in danger. Galletti made it clear that he identified the character of Alcina as a witch who conformed to the contemporary image of witches. Ariosto called her a *maga* or *fata*, not a *strega*. As Francesco Peña explains in his commentary on *De strigis* by Inquisitor Bernardo of Como, there were various denominations for witches in the sixteenth century, such as *lamiae, strigae, veneficae, incantatrice*s, *maleficae* and also *magae*.[38]

One may conclude that Galletti's interest in Alcina was due to the spreading belief in witches and superstition in the 'real' world. In this regard he was in line with the Fifth Lateran Council and the Council of Trent. It is noteworthy that he considered poetry to be a potential driving force in this development.

Ariosto's Alcina was based on an ancient poetic witch character who—and this is remarkable—was treated in both theological and demonological writings: the goddess (θεα) Circe, who enchanted Odysseus' men by turning them into swine in Homer's *Odyssey* (canto 10). Sources show at least two ways to interpret the character of Circe. One is found in the manual on exorcism by Menghi. In dealing with transformations of human beings performed by witches, Menghi corroborates his thoughts with canon law and Augustine, who dedicates a chapter to Varro's relations of transformations in his *De civitate Dei*.

37 On the figure of Alcina, daughter of Morgan Le Fay see e.g. J. Matthews, *The Element of the Arthurian Tradition* (Londmead: Element, 1989), ch. 4.

38 See Peña, *Annotationes in tractatum de strigis*, 156, cf. id., *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica*, lib. 2, ch. 2.

Menghi refers to experiences of witchcraft that he apparently considers to be true historical facts ("a questo proposito sono molte isperienze"), among which are transformations of human beings effected by Circe and other women who accommodated knights. As they transformed men into beasts, he considers them sorceresses; he refers to Circe as the most famous sorceress ("famosissima maga") but, according to canon law, such transformations were no more than illusions ("le cose apparono trasmutate in altre similitudini").[39]

By contrast, in the poetics of Giovanni Antoniano Viperani, *De arte poetica*, dedicated to Cardinal Perenot de Granvelle, Circe is understood as a fictional character within the semantic structure of the text. Viperano, who was royal chaplain and historiographer to King Philip II, and later bishop of Giovinazzo, interprets her transformations of men as an allegory of human vice.[40] His and Menghi's texts both date to the second half of the century. The two approaches depended on the attitude and tolerance of their authors. The different perspectives and disciplines in which Circe is discussed may have come into play here as well. Although they shared a religious background, Menghi dealt with Circe in the context of demonology and canon law, while Viperano did so in the profane field of poetics.

Profane sixteenth-century commentaries accompanying the *Orlando furioso* and *Cinque canti* often echo Viperano's point of view. They suggest an allegorical reading, according to which Alcina and her magic represent the danger of lasciviousness ("lascivia") for man.[41] One cannot exclude the possibility that Galletti might have considered an allegorical interpretation, but, since he concentrated on Alcina as a witch, he demonstrated his awareness of a religious perspective shared by Menghi and Augustine. He was interested in protecting the reader's soul and its salvation. Of course, Alcina is only one example of the censorship of a witch character, but it gives an idea of why profane vernacular poetry became a challenge for censors. At least in theory, censors had to assess the effect of a fictional poem on its readership.

The concepts of truth and reading aesthetics are likewise important in other examples of Galletti's *Censura* such as the censorship of Ricciardetto's story of a sexual transformation, mentioned above. The story was criticized although the text made it clear that it had been invented by the character Ricciardetto. Galletti points to the transformation of the sex. The main reason for this censorship may be found in the poetic treatment of magic:

---

39 Cf. Menghi, *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica*, 299, Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 18, 17.

40 Cf. Giovan Antonio Viperano, *De arte poetica* (Antwerp: Christoffel Plantijn, 1579), 48.

41 See, for instance, the editions *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Giolito, 1550 and 1552), (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558), with *Cinque canti* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1565).

> Del canto 25 si devono levar via le otto stanze empie e profane, ove s'introduce Ricciardetto, contare una metamorphose di sexo, comincisi da quella, che ha tal principio:
> Et ho possanza far cose stupende (25.62.1)[42]

Galletti suggests the suppression of eight stanzas (*OF* 25.62–69). It is noteworthy that he recommends beginning with stanza 62 although the transformation is not described until stanza 64. Stanza 62 tells how the nymph praises her supernatural power ("ho possanza far cose stupende"). Galletti explicitly states that he understands Ricciardetto's story to be no more than a story ("ove s'introduce Ricciardetto, contare una metamorphose di sexo . . ."); nonetheless, the nymph's claim does not conform to the Catholic faith. Like the description of Alcina's magic deeds, Galletti felt that this claim could imply the danger of nourishing superstition in the reader's mind, and considered it best to erase it together with the relating verses.

The indicated passage also includes the narration of an intimate sexual encounter between the nymph and Ricciardetto. Galletti deemed it lascivious and recommended its removal. His reference to the transformation of the sex is not irrelevant. He could simply have spoken of a transformation, but he took time to specify it. As the narration of the sexual activity is also addressed, his criticism may be about morality in another respect, with homoerotic implications.

The magician Malagigi is not a central character of the poem, but he attracted Galletti's attention (*OF* 26.128.4). Malagigi is able to stop the sun in its path with the help of his spell book. To attribute so great a power to a pagan magician appeared exaggerated to Galletti. He explains that such a depiction contravenes divine providence:

> Nella 96 (=128) stanza che comincia: Malagigi, che sa d'ogni ecc., truovato questo verso degno d'esser tolto:
> con che fermare il sole era possente
> Non si dee ametter tanta possanza in un Mago, con error contrario alla divina providenza. (*OF* 26.128.4)[43]

What is striking is that Galletti does not criticize the depiction of such characters, but rather the manner in which they were depicted and how they performed. This is understandable if we consider that the existence of witches

42 See Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

43 Ibid.

had been confirmed by the Roman Church. Witches were being persecuted by the Roman Church and their magic was taken seriously. Their appearance in poetry was actually a reflection of historical individuals, and therefore justifiable. The danger was that they represented false belief, so stories that did not depict them in accordance with the Catholic faith were dangerous. For this reason Galletti was only required to verify that their role matched the Catholic faith; in other words, they needed a verisimile and credible depiction whereby verisimilitude and credibility were defined by Catholic faith.

This theory may explain why Galletti did not criticize the wizard Atlante. Unlike Alcina, Atlante is not said to have the power to transform human figures or perform things disallowed by the Catholic faith. He makes use of deceptions, creating illusionary appearances ("sembianze") of the ladies Bradamante and Angelica in order to lead Ruggiero and Orlando and other knights to his enchanted palace (*OF* 11.19ss and 12.6), which eventually dissolves in smoke and mist ("in fumo e in nebbia," *OF* 22.22–23). Atlante's enchantments are therefore not depicted as real, but as wonders, "mira". This character, along with his magic arts, conforms to the contemporary idea of a magician.

One might object that Galletti did not mention the fay Manto (*OF* 43.98.8–99). Manto is immortal and transforms herself into a snake once a week but is said to be able to take the shape of all sorts of animals. In order to help Adonio she turns into a little dog who can dance, obey "with human manners" ("con maniere umane") (*OF* 43.108.3–6) and even produce golden coins (*OF* 43.110.3–5). According to Galletti's line of argumentation she should have been censored, but, as mentioned above, Galletti's censorship contains only a selection of passages recommended for correction.

Animals with supernatural faculties, or "marvelous" animals, are hardly mentioned in Galletti's censorships. He did not deal with the horses Baiardo and Rabicano, Astolfo's horse, which belonged to Argalia and was nourished with air (*OF* 8.41.3–4), the winged horse or hippogriff, the orca (*OF* 8.51.6), the Orco (*OF* 17.29) or the sea monster, nor are the allegorical monsters in Alcina's realm or the giantess Erifilla (*OF* 7.4.8) mentioned.[44] The reason for this is not immediately clear because the existence or non-existence of these creatures had not been proven in the sixteenth century. Torquato Tasso's dialogue *Apologia in difesa della Gerusalemme liberata* may take us further. Tasso reflects on creatures that Ariosto might have invented. The interlocutor Forestiero suggests that harpies (*OF* 2.34.6) had been previously described by Kalais and Zetes in the *Argonautica* by Apollonius of Rhodes. Creatures that might not

44 On supernatural creatures in *Orlando furioso* see Julia M. Kisacky, *Magic in Boiardo and Ariosto* (New York: Lang, 2000), ch. 4.

have been invented earlier included the hippogriff, the monsters that attacked Ruggiero and the monster that fought with the horse Baiardo (*OF* 33.84–5).[45]

One animal to which Galletti referred is the snake in canto 13. Ariosto narrates that Orlando and his army combated men in a cave. Some of the men died at once while others managed to escape. In reference to their destiny, Ariosto compares them to snakes that hide under stones, suggesting that a snake that can escape from its uncovered hide might have befriended the saints (*OF* 13.39.5). This idea implies that a snake which can escape could be rescued by saints. Although this is intended to raise the question of how some people survive a battle while others do not, it may have seemed to Galletti to have been a misuse of the Christian faith. Galletti was not willing to tolerate this image, and recommended its deletion. He also pointed out that it was an imitation of Erasm of Rotterdam, demonstrating that he was familiar with works by the censored humanist, and that he applied such knowledge when he classified poetic works.

> Nel canto terzodecimo dalla stanza 39 levisi quel verso precipitoso e irreverente e fatto a imitatione di quelle schiochezze temerarie dell'Erasmo:
> una altra ch'hebbe più propitii i santi (*OF* 13.39.5)
> Par che introduca un serpente haver havuto vita da i santi, quando scampò da un colpo mortale di un huomo.

Similar things appeared in the correction prepared at the Inquisition of Ferrara. The description of Baiardo in canto 2 was to be completely removed. The three stanzas in which the horse is likened to a human being on an intellectual level was to be deleted. It is said to have human intelligence, and an ability to think and help Rinaldo ("si levi, Fece il destrier che haveva inteletto humano, sino a: Rinaldo il caccia d'ira, e d'amor caldo," *OF* 2.20.5–23.5).[46]

4.2.2 *Supernatural Beings*

Since censors examined marvelous human characters, animals and their deeds, it is only natural that they also considered the depiction of supernatural beings involved in literary action, such as pagan deities of classical mythology, ghosts, demons, and the Christian God. Vivid examples of this kind of censorship can be found in Galletti's judgment on *Furioso* as well as in Barrio's criticism of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. In addition, the censorship of works on poetic theory opens another perspective. Censors corrected and 'improved' works on

45 Tasso, *Apologia*, 431.

46 See Appendix, doc. 1.5a.

poetics in the same manner as other texts. Consciously or unconsciously they likewise corrected theoretical reflection upon poetic material. Consequently, censorship entered a new thematic field, namely the theory of poetry, another cultural sphere. It affected how poetry was spoken of, which influenced how it was written. Such was the case of the censorship of Lodovico Castelvetro's translation and commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics*. It provides insight into how censors dealt with theoretical ideas on the depiction of supernatural forces, and enriches observations on judgments on poetic works.

We shall first discuss poetry. Ghosts and demons, two kinds of supernatural beings common to contemporary folk belief, are depicted in the *Furioso* and examined by Galletti and the censors of the Inquisition of Ferrara; however, as judgments on canto 3 reveal, ghosts and demons were not treated equally. Merlin the magician provides us with an example of how ghosts were regarded.[47] Merlin is not introduced as a living human character but as a ghost ("spirito"). The *maga* Melissa explains to Bradamante that Merlin was tricked by the Lady of the Lake and buried alive in a tomb that he himself had built (*OF* 3.10). Since then his ghost has lived on, awaiting judgment (*OF* 3.11).

Galletti's criticism of the Merlin character begins with a statement in which the censor declares that he consciously refrains from explaining his identity.[48] He assumes that the magician is known to his addressees, the members of the Congregation for the Index. He may have had in mind the Roman *Index* of 1557, which had condemned Merlinus Anglus as an author, or the prohibition of the *Liber obscurarum praedictionum*, attributed to Merlinus Anglus (*Indexes* 1557–1564), or the banned Arturus Britannus (*Indexes* 1557–1564). It is probable that the appearance of these names, especially Merlin's, in anticlerical Joachimitic and Protestant texts influenced his judgment, providing a reason for the above prohibitions.[49] Galletti's judgment of the stanzas *OF* 3.10–11 concentrates on the depiction of Merlin as a ghost. He comments that Ariosto starts to speak ("favellare") very imprudently ("molto imprudentemente") in the tenth stanza,

47 On the figure of Merlin see e.g. U. Müller, 'Merlin', in id. and W. Wunderlich (eds.), *Verführer, Schurken, Magier* (St. Gallen: UVK: Fachverlag für Wissenschaft und Studium, 2001), 663–82.

48 See Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

49 See *ILI*, viii, 156, also 355: A file of the Congregation for the Index states: "Arturus Britannus nominatur in epistolis lutheranis." in Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, 221r. Reusch, i, 284, reminds us that Gabriel de Puy-Herbault also mentions Merlinus Anglus und Arturus Britannus among authors of bad books which are widely spread and that he assumes that Arturus Britannus of the chivalric romance is to be identified with King Arthur. It would thus have been incorrect to substitute Arturus Britannus with Thomas Arturus of the sixteenth century in the *Index*.

and he seems to question Ariosto's reason. Nonetheless, he permitted the tenth stanza to remain, unlike the eleventh stanza:

> Col corpo morto il vivo spirito alberga,
> sin ch'oda il suon de l'angelica tromba
> che dal ciel lo bandisca o che ve l'erga,
> secondo che sarà corvo o colomba. (*OF* 3.11.1–4)

According to Galletti, the idea that Merlin's ghost was haunting a grave did not conform to Catholic faith, which pronounced that after death a soul could not remain unpunished or unrewarded. He deems the idea entirely unacceptable and supports his position by making reference to Fra Sixtus's *Bibliotheca Sancta*, indirectly suggesting the correction or elimination of the passage:

> Qual sia stato Merlino di chi si parla, non entro a discorrere più lungamente, dico si bene, un orror sì grande devessi cancellare dalle Christiane carte, è contro la fede asserire che l'anima stia sino al ultimo giorno del giuditio senza premio e gastigo . . .

Next, Galletti objects to Merlin the Magician being called a "prophet" ("profeta"). He tries to convict Ariosto by means of his own text (*OF* 3.10 and 3.13). He accuses the poet of being stupid, condescendingly pointing out that Ariosto wrote that the *mago* had been deceived by the Lady of the Lake despite his 'prophetic' gift, yet called him a prophet:

> Vedesi di più la schiochezza del Poeta in questo canto assai solenne, nella stanza X chiama Merlino Mago: Ch'edificò Merlino il savio Merlino Mago, aggiugne [sic] l'inganno ch'una Donna gli ordì: Dove ingannollo la Donna del lago. E nondimeno nella stanza 13 lo fa chiamar Profeta, così introduce Bradamente: Di che merito son io / ch'antiveggian propheti il venir mio.[50]

In addition, the prohibition of the *Liber obscurarum praedictionum*, the book of occult prophecies mentioned above, might have entered into this criticism of Galletti. Principally, however, Galletti held to a Catholic definition of prophecy which, in his view, was inflexible. He explains in his commentary on the poet's invocation of the muses at the beginning of the third canto that

50 See Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

prophecy is a divine gift: "… essendo la prophetia dono molto sovrano, che da Idio solamente deriva." As long as he considered Merlin to be an infidel, he could not accept the idea that God had provided him with such a gift.[51]

The *Correttione* of the *Furioso* prepared at the Inquisition of Ferrara helps to verify whether Galletti's criticism can be justified from a censorial point of view. The Inquisition recommended the deletion of Merlin's description as a prophet as well as the verse "che chiudeva di Merlin l'animo, e l'ossa" (*OF* 3.14.4). Moreover, the somewhat similarly sounding lines "ove la bella conca / in sé chiudea del gran profeta l'ossa" (*OF* 3.22.5–6) were to be expurgated, and the expression "great prophet" ("gran profeta") was to be erased and substituted.[52] Thus, the *Correttione* makes it clear that there was no problem with introducing the character of Merlin; what had to be corrected was the way in which Merlin was depicted as a 'living' ghost able to intervene in earthly life with his 'prophetic' gift. Galletti's judgment was thus indirectly confirmed by the *Correttione*.

This position was also shared by Menghi in regard to demonology. As an expert in this field he considered the idea that souls of the deceased became demons to be a pestiferous doctrine ("questa pestifera dottrina"). He explains that it does not seem reasonable to assume that the soul, once separate from the body, wanders about on earth, for the souls of the just would be in God's hands, the souls of the bad in Hell, and the souls of the unbaptized in Limbo.[53] As these examples suggest, depictions of ghosts, as understood in the Gothic novel of the eighteenth century, were rejected, but might have been accepted had they been presented differently, as suggested by further evidence.

The document on the expurgation of Fornari's comment on Ariosto's third canto shows that Fornari's censors were not satisfied with the depiction of Merlin either. They came up with a solution to preserve the text and demanded that the fictional aspect be emphasized more strongly. They added a little detail to Fornari's comment, an apposition strong enough to question the truth of this depiction:

> A carta 126 linea 10: doppo (uscir di fori) aggiungasi (come favoleggiano) et si seguiti (per la forza etc.).

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid., doc. 1.5a.

53 Cf. Menghi, *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica*, 8.

The corrected version would read:

> Di che per molte prove che poi tentasse Merlino a farsi aprire non fu bastante giamai là onde vi rimase morto. Ma lo spirto non potendo ne ancho esso uscire di fuori come favoleggiano per la forza di quelle parole che facevano l'arca tenace et forte, parlava et rispondeva di là dentro a chiunque havesse havuto voglia di ragionargli.[54]

More questions are raised by the invocation of demons and appearances of ghosts which Ariosto depicted in the same canto. The *maga* Melissa draws a circle on the floor of the church, described as a "sacred circle" ("sacro cerchio," *OF* 3.22.2). She tells Bradamante to enter the circle, and covers her with a pentagram so that Bradamente will feel protected from the ghosts expected to appear. Then Melissa, reading from a magic book, speaks to the demons ("demoni") and, when the ghosts ("spiriti") of her descendants emerge from a cave, introduces them to Bradamente (*OF* 3.21.1–3.22).

Galletti does not mention this scene, yet the reason does not become immediately clear, as the invocation of demons and the appearance of ghosts seem to exemplify occurrences explicitly prohibited by the ninth Tridentine *Rule* of the *Index*. One may assume that Galletti did not address these incidents because he chose only to present a selection of errors and sins. He may have assumed that the Congregation for the Index would explore the remainder of the canto and complete the censorship of the scene. However, the Inquisition of Ferrara also left the invocation of demons and the appearance of the ghosts unscathed. Their instruction to erase the words "church" ("chiesa," *OF* 3.21.1), "cemetery" ("cimiterio," *OF* 12.1), "sacred circle" ("sacro cerchio," *OF* 3.22.2) and "great prophet" ("gran profeta," *OF* 3.22.6) certainly sought to separate the sacred from the profane as, by setting an occult ritual in a church, Ariosto may have profaned a holy place.[55] From the poetic standpoint, however, this correction extended beyond the linguistic level because it censored the occult ritual, resulting in a crucial element, the setting, being suppressed, which eliminated the meaning of the scene.

The central question, however, is why the invocation of demons and the appearance of ghosts was not corrected or, at the very least, mentioned. The answer might be simple. From the censorial perspective the invocation was not an impossible event, despite being prohibited by law. Therefore in Galletti's view it is not a description that could make the reader believe what cannot be

54 See Appendix, doc. 1.6.

55 Ibid. doc. 1.5a.

or happen but rather what was not to be imitated. So, if it is permitted here, this is evidence of the censors' tolerance. Regarding the appearance of ghosts, one might conclude that, unlike Merlin's ghost, these ghosts were not described as "living beings," nor did they intervene in earthly life but were merely presented as apparitions. In his brief commentary on *Furioso*, Sperone Speroni defines them as deceptions or illusions, more specifically as "diabolical illusions" ("diaboliche illusioni"), in which neither Melissa nor Bradamante could truly foresee the destinies of Bradamante's descendants.[56] The poem allows such an interpretation. The ghosts might have been regarded as products of magical powers created with the help of demons.

Aside from ghosts and demons, mythological deities of pagan antiquity were repeatedly discussed. They experienced a slightly different destiny since they stood for an idolatrous cult and appeared frequently in Renaissance poetry. Some Catholics counted them among the deceptions created by demons. Similar to Antonio Possevino, Giulio Ottonelli, doctor of both laws from Ferrara, went so far as to maintain that Satan seduced poets and forced them to write of superstitious idolatry. Ottonelli was involved in a debate with Lionardo Salviati and the Accademia della Crusca and authored books on Catholic poetry and aesthetics, such as the *Discorso sopra l'abuso del dire Sua Santità, Sua Maestà, Sua Altezza, senza nominare il Papa, l'Imperadore, il Principe, con le Difese della Gerusalemme Liberata dalle opposizioni degli Accademici della Crusca*, which appeared in 1585, and *Il Dorateo Dialogo di Giulio Ottonelli contro allo scriver men cristiano*, initially unpublished.

Ottonelli believes that Satan uses stories of pagan deities to seduce man to idolatry and polytheism. This idea is close to the picture of Satan drawn by Origen and Simancas, who considered superstitious beliefs in general to be diabolical means of seduction.[57] Ottonelli further maintains that pagan gods are illusions and errors of paganism ("inganni e errori del paganesimo") found in pastoral poetry. He advises Catholic poets to refrain from writing pastoral poems or engaging with such material in any way, as even addressing it could be dangerous for the soul.[58]

---

56 See Sperone Speroni, *Sopra l'Ariosto*, in id., *Opere di m. Sperone Speroni degli Alvarotti, tratte da' mss originali* (Venice: Domenico Occhi, 1740), v, 520.

57 Cf. Simancas, 144.

58 Cf. Giulio Ottonelli, *Il Dorateo Dialogo di Giulio Ottonelli contro allo scriver men cristiano dove per incidenza si toccano alcune altre cose di simigliante guisa men pie*, pubblicato per la prima volta sopra un manoscritto della biblioteca estense dal C.M.V. (Modena, 1826), 36, id., *Discorso sopra l'abuso del dire Sua Santità, Sua Maestà, Sua Altezza, senza nominare il Papa, l'Imperadore, il Principe, con le Difese della Gerusalemme Liberata dalle opposizioni*

Censors of vernacular poetry did not go so far as to discuss the origin of mythological deities in their judgments, but they did endeavor to sort out the poetic worlds of gods. Castelvetro's vernacular translation of Aristotle's *Poetics*, furnished with a detailed commentary (Vienna: Gaspare Stainhofer, 1570), was of particular interest to the Roman Inquisition because Castelvetro had been banned as a heretic on the grounds of Protestant convictions. His complete works were added to the *Indexes* of 1590, 1593 and 1596 with the remark that they were banned until corrected.[59] The judgments on his poetic work underlined its utility for the study of poetry and endeavored to preserve it.

The earliest censorship of Castelvetro's poetics I could find is the one by Abbot Vincenzo Guarini da Centula, a *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index. It introduces Castelvetro, his works and their cultural significance, points out general problems of the poetic treatise and lists censored passages with corrections. Guarini presented it to the Congregation for the Index on 18 May 1590 and again on 27 May 1590 together with Don Seraphinus. Another document was prepared by Fra Marcantonio Marcello at the Inquisition of Venice. He used the Basel edition of 1576 and based his judgment on Castelvetro's quotations from the *Decamerone* on an edition of the same work which had been corrected by Salviati and appeared in 1594. The Venetian document is undated but must have been written after 1594, perhaps around 1603.[60]

Among other things, Castelvetro discusses the shaping of the marvelous in tragedy, and the question of which material would best evoke pity and fear in the reader. Because tragic action requires a reversal of fortune, it needs a conflict whereby the tragic hero falls from fortune into misfortune. Castelvetro reflects upon a way to design and solve such a conflict and discussed Bible stories and classical mythology in terms of utility and efficiency. In Guarini's view, it is not pagan mythology that is problematic, perhaps because Castelvetro introduces examples from classical authors and points to the aesthetic aspect of their reception, the purification of the reader's or viewer's soul. Guarini intervenes when Castelvetro treats material from canonical texts in the same manner as pagan *favole*; for instance, Castelvetro deals with the Christian God

---

degli Accademici della Crusca (Ferrara: Giulio Vasellini, 1585). See also Gabriel de Puy-Herbault, *Von Verbot und Auffhebung deren Buecher und Schriften, so in gemain one nachtheil und verletzung des gewissens auch der frumb und erbarkeit nit moegen gelesen oder behalten werden* (Munich: Adam Berg, 1581) i, 21v (Latin: Gabriel Putherbeus, *Theotimus sive De tollendis et expungendis malis libris, iis praecipue, quos via incolumi fide comple-rique legere queant* (Paris: Jean de Roigny, 1549).

59 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 829, 889, 959.

60 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 40r–v and Appendix, doc. 1.12a–c.

and the deities of Roman or Greek mythology simultaneously and seems to treat them alike. Guarini decisively advises that biblical examples ("exempla") be eliminated. Unlike pagan myths, he maintains, they are true ("verissima") and therefore cannot be listed among the *favole*.[61]

Guarini's position was shared by Fra Marcantonio Marcello. At the very beginning of his censorship Fra Marcantonio states that his corrections deal with contents that contravene good morals and religion. He surprisingly explains that he consciously overlooked numerous observations and examples ("considerazioni e essempi") regarding religion because he is aware that matters of religion ("cose della religione"), when described adequately ("debitamente descritte"), are tolerated in poetry. He refers to a number of religious poems, such as *Divina Commedia*, *Angeleide* of Erasmo da Valvasón, *De Partu Virginis* of Sannazaro, *Christias* of Vida and many others which he does not name. This observation coincided with a late sixteenth-century development of Counter-Reformation politics.

As shown above, the Congregation for the Index discussed and relaxed the censorship of religious poetry and decreed a more tolerate policy in 1603. Fra Marcantonio's remark might reflect this shift, and possibly serve as a means of dating the document:

> . . . le cose, che potessero offendere la Religione, o i buoni costumi, Nelle quali ho lasciato stare molte considerationi, et essempi di cose della Religione; essendo che anche le cose della Religione debitamente descritte, si permettono in Poesia, come si vede nella comedia di Dante, Nell'Angeleide del Valvasone, nel Poema de Partu Virginis del Sannazaro, nella Christiade del Vida, et in molti altri Poemi.[62]

The comment may seem superficial, and what follows is a very undetailed discussion of the work. Fra Marcantonio explains that he neglected the religious matter, quite untypical of censors, rendering it even more interesting that he dealt with Castelvetro's reflections upon 'narrative techniques' such as the methods by which words spoken by poetic characters were selected.

Castelvetro subdivides speakers of the story ("parlatori introdotti nella narratione") into different types. Aside from the narrator ("persona narrante"), he introduces five other categories of speakers. The first category is that of human characters naturally capable of speaking. The second category includes heavenly characters such as deities, angels, and souls. The third category is

61 Castelvetro, *Poetica d'Aristotele*, 172ss, Appendix, doc. 1.12a.

62 Ibid. 1.12b.

composed of personifications of vices and virtues of the soul such as envy, hate and chastity, as well as states and conditions of human life such as prosperity, poverty and glory. Cities and provinces personified by voiced female characters are also included. The fourth category is comprised of a variety of sensitive and vegetative animals ("animali sensibili e vegetabili") while the fifth contains vegetative objects without senses such as stones, gold or furniture ("cose insensate and vegetabili").[63] Fra Marcantonio focuses on the second category and seeks to improve its description:

> . . . carta 52, linea 5: La seconda sono (per così dire) gli Iddij celestiali et coloro che sono creduti godere la gloria eterna del cielo, secondo le credenze delle Religioni, come Dio verace, gli Angeli eletti et l'anime beate et (appresso Gentili) Giove et Giunone, Apollo, Mercurio e simili, insieme con gli Iddij terrestri, marini et infernali, come sono le ninfe de fonti, de prati, di monti, di selve e i fauni, e i satiri et brevemente tutti i Demoni, et come sono Nettuno, Proteo et simili, et Galatea con l'altre ninfe del mare, et come sono Plutone, Proserpina, le furie et così fatte Deità con l'anime tormentate et con l'anime godenti et tranquillanti ne campi elisi o come sono i Diavoli et l'anime de dannati. Percioché tutti i sopradetti sono creduti dagli huomeni grossi havere forma humana et per conseguente (secondo la proprietà della natura loro) poter parlare, o perché si deano gli huomeni ad intendere, che in così fatta forma sieno appariti alcuna volta [o perché non si possano fare a credere, che gl'Iddii et l'altre sopradette sustanze vere o favolose habbiano forma diversa dalla loro, reputando la loro perfettissima et fatta a similitudine della divina.][64]

Two divine worlds are mingled, as in the passage studied by Guarini. In his comment on the second category, Castelvetro introduces pagan deities such as Jupiter, Juno, Apollo and Mercury next to angels, souls and the Christian God ("Dio verace"). He includes different types of nymphs, fauns, satyrs and furies with devils, souls of the damned, and blessed souls of Paradise.

As Fra Marcantonio explains in his censorship, underlining signifies suppression of text and brackets indicate added text. It is therefore easy to see that he did not make radical deletions; rather, he made slight changes in order to

---

63 Cf. Lodovico Castelvetro, *Poetica d'Aristotele, vulgarizzata et sposta per Lodovico Castelvetro*, riveduta (Basel: Pietro de Sebadonis, 1576), 52 (*Parte principale prima, particella ottava, spositione*), in the edition (Vienna d'Austria: Stainhofer, 1570), 28v.

64 See Appendix, doc. 1.12b; *Poetica d'Aristotele* (Basel: Pietro de Sebadonis, 1576) 52 or (Vienna: Stainhofer, 1570) 28v.

render the wording more precise and meaningful. His corrections show that he worked on a clear distinction between the sacred and profane concerning speaker categories, and tried to clarify which characters were part of which cult and whether they were to be considered true or invented. His correction may therefore be viewed as being constructive rather than destructive; it aimed to preserve the text by using clear and carefully chosen language to design the characters.

Fra Marcantonio explains that referring to pagan deities as "iddii" is only a figure of speech ("per così dire"). He demonstrates that he considers the word "iddio" to be inappropriate because the characters should not be understood to be true deities. Although Castelvetro distinguishes between the two cults and provides his readers with information in order to deal adequately with the subsequent catalogue of divine and semi-divine characters, Fra Marcantonio does not consider this to be adequate. He attempts to make the distinction between the pagan and Christian cult clearer by heading the list of pagan characters "appresso Gentili." Two passages are deleted, one indicating the location "in the Elysian fields" ("ne campi elisi"), where mythological deities and souls are to be found, the other describing the power of convincing people to believe that these deities ("si deano gli huomeni ad intendere") had indeed existed in earlier times. He notably does not change much in this passage, seeking rather to work on an almost invisible level; he retains the text and refines it by adding a few linguistic elements.

One may wonder why Fra Marcantonio dealt with this particular aspect of Castelvetro's work. It is important to remember that the design of characters, in particular the speakers of tragedy, was essential to both tragedies and poetry in general. By performing, characters represented, mirrored and communicated ideas; therefore keeping a careful eye on how they were contrived was a useful and logical censorial measure.

Related to the design of characters is the design of literary action i.e. what characters do and how they do it. Literary action seems to have been of lesser importance in Guarini's and Fra Marcantonio's assessments, but others scrutinised it more carefully, as can be seen in Gabriele Barrio's observation on Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, in which Barrio treats the representation of gods of ancient mythology. This example elucidates Fra Marcantonio's work on Castelvetro:

> Jacobus Sannazarus in suis plebeiis scriptis, ut est huiusmodi hominum generis mos, pastores inducit, qui saepe deorum pluralitatem teneant, eos precentur, summos, benignos et potentes dicunt, eis gratias agant, deas venerandas et solas appellant, plura de Priapo loquitur, et nescio

> quam nympham Priapum amplectentem obscoenam rem facit, superstitiosa verba scribit . . .[65]

Barrio points to what he identifies as a custom of vernacular poets, or "this kind of people" ("huiusmodi hominum generis mos"), while Sannazaro describes a pagan cult of shepherds in which some shepherds worship, pray, and express gratitude to a number of deities, addressing them as "the highest, most benign and powerful." Goddesses are introduced as "venerable and the only ones." Priapus is mentioned often and, together with a nymph, he is involved in an uncouth incident. Barrio concludes that Sannazaro used "superstitious words." One problem is the description of a pagan cult as such, which includes superstitious and likewise obscene contents. Another one is the characters introduced by Sannazaro, shepherds and deities.

Marc Deramaix observes that Barrio's criticism of such "inadequate" representations of polytheism concerns the imitation of Virgil's *Bucolics, imitatio vergiliana*. He makes the same observation regarding Barrio's censorship of Sannazaro's *De partu Virginis* found in the same document.[66] This is a crucial aspect of the censorship of poetry because imitating classical models was a core strategy in poetic writing. The crux of the matter was that the imitation of classical poets implied that two religious systems were combined in one work by a Catholic author, a work which, from the censorial standpoint, was expected to be Catholic. The theological implication of the imitation of pagan poetry was likewise addressed in contemporary poetics, as demonstrated by Deramaix.[67]

Barrio was quite familiar with classical poetry, as is plain from his *Pro lingua latina*. He must therefore have been aware of the implications of this criticism. His censorships of *De partu Virginis* and Dante's *Divina Commedia* reveal that he recognized Virgil's *Aeneid* as a model of *De partu Virginis* and *Divina Commedia*. He understood that poets imitated one another, and appreciated the imitation of classical poetry as long as the Catholic faith was not interfered with.

More importantly, the imitation and reception of classical poetry was regulated by the *Index* of 1564. *Rule* VII focuses on works with lascivious and obscene contents, and contains the notorious clause which protected a large part of classical poetry from censorship because of elegance of language

65 See Appendix, doc. 1.3i. Cf. Deramaix.

66 See Appendix, doc. 1.3i.

67 Cf. Deramaix, 191–3.

and style ("propter sermonis elegantiam et proprietatem").[68] It shows that, from a censorial perspective, pagan poets were valued for their language and style; in other words, their use of form. Contents that did not conform to the Catholic cult were tolerated if the degree of lasciviousness and obscenity was not deemed completely intolerable, as in Ovid's *Ars amatoria*, Martial's epigrams unless expurgated ("non expurgatus"), dialogues by Lucian and Aretino and *Celestina*.[69] It is clear why the imitation of pagan material in a book by a Catholic author could be problematic in the censor's eye.

The issue, however, is more complex as the field of poetic imitation is vast and manifold. As Barrio's comment suggests, it would be oversimplifying to conclude that the depiction of polytheism or the imitation of classical models was blindly censored or absolutely prohibited; rather, what mattered the most to Barrio was the actions performed by the characters rather than the entities they depicted. Action and character were connected, but actions were generally more important than the mere presence of the character. Deramaix assumed that it was not Barrio's intention to attack Sannazaro's aesthetics,[70] but it might have been. Sannazaro brought the pagan cult to life in the gestures of his characters and Barrio's criticism of them was a criticism of the literary action and the description of idolatry combined with immorality. Even though Sannazaro's poem is fictional and set in a mythological context, Barrio was apparently unwilling to accept any representation of an idolatrous cult. Despite having been written by a Catholic, the poem does not represent what was credible from the Catholic standpoint, nor did Sannazaro state that the story had been invented.

Barrio's focus on the characters' actions demonstrates his particular interest in their speech: "eos [= deos] precentur, summos, benignos et potentes dicunt, eis gratias agant, deas venerandas et solas appellant". Barrio distinguishes 'speech acts.' Pointing to superstitious elements, he uses the word "words" ("verba") rather than "things" ("res") because, here, his focus is less on the description of what the shepherds are doing than on the effects of their words. Using speech, the shepherds attribute characteristics to pagan deities that should only pertain to the Christian God. When the shepherds pray and give thanks, the pagan deities are given the role of God. The shepherds' speech is, of course, part of the action, making it seem more real, which is why direct speech is used in scenic representations; it is closer to a verisimile representation, and has a greater effect on the reader. Barrio did not necessarily have such

68 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 922.

69 Cf. *Regulas generales*, in *Concilii Tridentini tractatuum*, pars 2.1, 605.

70 Cf. Deramaix, 182.

theoretical thoughts; the effect was a natural consequence of poetic design, which he, as a well-read person, would have been aware of.

Thus, it was not only important who spoke but what was said by whom. We will return to this later in the context of religious language in vernacular love lyrics. Considering Barrio's criticism in more general terms, it not only concerned the *imitatio vergiliana* and Sannazaro's *Arcadia* but also this form of pastoral poetry, indirectly resulting in the censorship of an entire genre with classical models and a long tradition.

One way of treating mythological material adequately, at least in Barrio's view, and of using this form of pastoral poetry, would probably have been to eliminate the pagan cult. Another way would have been the allegorization of pagan deities, a popular approach at the time. Allegorization demanded allegories to conform to the Catholic concept of the world created by the Catholic God and protected by his providence. An example that critics have extensively examined is that of the Christian interpretation of the allegory of pagan Fortune. A third form of allegorization could have been found in linguistics, as adopted by Fra Marcantonio. It was imperative to emphasize that pagan deities had been invented by pagans, and were not real from the Catholic perspective.

A deeper insight into the censorial interpretation of mythology and poetry is found in Barrio's judgment on Petrarch's love poetry. Amor, the pagan god of love, inhabits numerous medieval and Renaissance poems and, as observed by Barrio, plays an important role in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. This fact emerges from a list of ten poems (*RVF* 214, 264, 69, 331, 212, 29, 89, 211, 221, 240) accompanied by a brief judgment. According to Barrio, Petrarch denies man's free will and divine providence so that he believes himself to be compelled by fate to love Laura. Petrarch blames Amor, here called Cupid, for his miserable situation, and claims that his reason has succumbed to lust:

> In his octo cantilenis liberam hominis voluntatem et providentiam negat, et se fato obstrictum fuisse dicit ut lauram adamaret, et culpam in cupidinem reiicit. dicit etiam rationem appetitui succubuisse.[71]

Was Amor considered merely a mythological deity, perhaps entailing the accusation of idolatry, or could Barrio have found and accepted an additional allegorical meaning in the character? His comment addresses several aspects, but for the moment I would like to explore this reference and take a closer look at how Barrio examined Amor's role in sonnets *RVF* 69, 89 and 240.

71 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b and e.

In sonnets *RVF* 69 and 89, Petrarch allows Amor to be a manipulating force. The lover describes his efforts to escape Amor's influence. The first attempt is prevented by Amor's ministers ("ministri," *RVF* 69.9–14). In a second attempt, Amor lures him with a 'new' Laura, who appears to the lover in various false shapes ("in sì mentite larve," *RVF* 89.6–12). In sonnet *RVF* 89, the lover has apparently freed himself from the "prison of Love" but, although aware of the danger his love poses to his salvation, he admits to missing the sweetness of passion.[72] Later, in sonnet *RVF* 240, the lover wishes to apologize to Laura for having left the right path, and asks Amor to do so on his behalf. He confesses that his reason ("la ragion," *RVF* 240.6) was subjugated by desire ("voler," *RVF* 240.7), and he wants her to know that she is the cause of his misery.

So far, in the literal sense, Barrio's comment seems correct from the censorial perspective. The lover blames Amor, a pagan deity, for his love and his reason giving way to lust. But do these two points not imply a paradox inasmuch as an exterior force is blamed for sin even as the development of the lover's interior life is described wherein reason subsides? It is not clear how Barrio wished his comment to be understood.

First, Barrio's paraphrase is not exact. Barrio refers to the deity as Cupid, ("cupido"), not Amor, the name used by Petrarch. He did not capitalize Cupid's name, but that is not remarkable as he rarely capitalized proper names in the document, not even the name of Christ. He thus departed from the original text and appears to have had a reason for doing so. He adjusted the deity's name to fit his interpretation of what he believed the character to represent: desire and carnal love. This interpretation may imply that Barrio did not read the poem literally, but allegorically, viewing Amor as the personification of love.

Barrio's interpretation would have been in line with a commentary on the *Canzoniere* by Alessandro Vellutello. Vellutello suggests that in sonnet *RVF* 69 Amor's ministers ("ministri") represented amorous thoughts ("amorosi pensieri").[73] Even if Amor was only an allegory for Barrio, he nonetheless understood that Petrarch blamed himself for his love, not a pagan deity. Seen from this perspective, his subsequent observation of subsiding reason makes perfectly sense.

Significantly, this argumentation was emphasized in the second copy of the censorship. Barrio begins his list of quotations and comments with Petrarch's

72 Cf. Johannes Bartuschat, 'Il ritratto di Laura (RVF 76–80)', in *Il Canzoniere. Lettura micro e macrotestuale*, ed. Michelangelo Picone (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 2007), 207–33, 208.

73 *Le volgari opere del Petrarcha con la spositione di Alessandro Vellutello da Lucca* (Venice: Giovanniantonio et fratelli da Sabbio, 1525), 79r.

opening sonnet, where the lover, feeling shame, explicitly confesses to be the cause ("causa") of all his troubles:

> Voi che ascoltate in rime . . .
> cognosco ben, sì come al popul tutto
> materia fui di error, unde sovente
> di me medesmo meco mi vergogno (*RVF* 1.1, 1.9–11)[74]

> His etiam verbis aperte fatetur se omnibus malorum causam fuisse seque huiusce rei pudere. Nunc alia subiciam.

In the first copy of Barrio's censorship, however, sonnet *RVF* 240 is listed a second time, with an annotation on its first verse: "I' ò pregato Amor, e 'l ne riprego" (*RVF* 240.1). Barrio merely repeats the literal meaning: Petrarch prays to Amor and remembers false gods:

> In hac cantilena non christum precatur, ut ipsum adiuvet, sed cupidinem exorat, ut ipsum apud lauram excuset, si vehementiore amore coactus rationem appetitui suppeditaverit. Et falsos deos amantes commemorat.[75]

This does not necessarily mean that Barrio denied a possible allegorical interpretation or that his judgment was inconsistent; it indicates that Barrio was drawing attention to the literal meaning, namely that God had been substituted by Amor. Amor, a fictional, non-existing deity, had been treated as an alternative to God. Barrio chose certain words to illustrate Petrarch's actions, which were more important to him than the allegorical meaning, as he explains in *Pro lingua latina*.

The interpretation of profane vernacular poetry was apparently not an option for Barrio; he did not deem it necessary.[76] Besides his censorship of *Canzoniere*, his assessment of *Furioso* also shows that there were cases where he approached a figurative reading, but in his view allegory could not excuse an idea or image that did not literally conform to Catholic faith. His reflection

---

74 Cf. *RVF* 1.9–11:
> Ma ben veggio or sì come al popol tutto
> favola fui gran tempo, onde sovente
> di me medesmo meco mi vergogno.

75 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b, Barrio adds: "Ut Judas, qui errore cognitu non ad apostolos ivit, sed ad pontifices."

76 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 403.

on the correct use of language elucidates this position. From his perspective, a poet could use language to ascribe something "that pertains only to God" to a pagan deity. Something happens in speech; verbal expression mirrors action. It is likely that he believed in a close relationship between words ("verba") and things ("res").

Barrio's understanding of Amor, therefore, is of secondary importance, as it was of secondary importance to him. He rejected the depiction of Amor treated in a manner reserved for the Christian God. Barrio's approach sheds further light on the censorships discussed above and helps to better understand Galletti's criticism of pagan deities in canto 18 in the *Furioso*.

In the *Furioso*, the Saracen knight Medoro prays to Luna, the moon goddess, to illuminate his way so he can find Dardinello. His prayer results in the clouds parting to allow the light of the moon to shine through. Galletti understands that Ariosto had invented the action ("finge l'Ariosto"); nevertheless, the text toys with the implication that the clear sky could either have resulted from Medoro's prayer or have been a mere coincidence:

> Nel istesso canto finge l'Ariosto poco più sotto, che la luna invocata da Midoro come Dea, e Dea vera, corrispondesse con gli effetti alla sua falsa fede, così dice egli:
> [—O santa dea, che dagli antiqui nostri
> debitamente sei detta triforme;
> ch'in cielo, in terra e ne l'inferno mostri
> l'alta bellezza tua sotto più forme,
> e ne le selve, di fere e di mostri
> vai cacciatrice seguitando l'orme;
> mostrami ove 'l mio re giaccia fra tanti,
> che vivendo imitò tuoi studi santi.—]
>
> La Luna a quel pregar la nube aperse,
> (o fosse caso o pur la tanta fede) [. . .] (*OF* 18.184–185.1–2)

For a similar reason, Galletti points to canto 3. The poet asks Phoebus, the pagan deity of the sun, to endow him with prophetic spirit ("un profetico lume") so as to enable him to continue his narration and tell the future of the Este genealogy. Galletti found the prayer to imply that the pagan deity had been ascribed the power to endow humans with the faculty of prophecy. This power, he objects, could only be ascribed to the Christian God, however: "Non mi par s'habbe a comportare che un poeta Christiano scrivendo a Christiani, possa attribuire tanta forza a Febo, di comunicar spirito prophetico." Thus, it was not

a problem that the pagan deity had been introduced; rather, Galletti's criticism refers to the way in which the deity, a mere invention from the Catholic point of view, had been shaped; that is, its role or function in the literary world.

There are more examples of similar critiques in censorship and poetics. A brief anonymous censorship considers the prohibited *Libro del Gigante Morante* to be inept and full of lies, and recommends that a passage where a holy plant gives Orlando prophetic instruction be corrected. Girolamo Frachetta considered it futile to invoke Apollo and the Muses in poetics, as Dante and Ariosto had done. Instead, he preferred the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.[77]

The problem, however, did not rest simply in what a poet did with his words. Galletti emphasized that Ariosto, a Catholic poet, had written for Catholic readers. This meant that, unlike pagan poets of antiquity, Ariosto was expected to depict literary action and characters in accordance with his faith and the faith of his readers. His writing had to be controlled and determined by his faith. As we have seen above in Galletti's comment on Alcina, he assessed Christian poets using a benchmark different from that used for pagan poets, and assumed that they were perceived differently by readers. He suggested that the adjective "prophetic" ("profetico") be substituted with something more neutral, such as "secret" ("secreto") that did not explicitly address the sacred dimension on the level of the Catholic faith.

Since the Christian God was to be preferred to mythological deities, the question arose as to how to treat him as a poetic character. There is scant material on this question, but again the documents on the *Furioso* are revealing because they specifically address this topic. In *Furioso*, the Christian God intervenes in the literary action, and is not always tolerated by the censors; for instance, he appears in canto 29, where he praises Isabella's death.

Isabella seeks a way to alleviate her pain over the loss of Zerbino and the amorous advances of Rodomonte by manipulating him to kill her. Isabella is praised for her actions by the poet as well as by God, who values her for her deed over and above Lucretia, who killed herself after being raped by Sextus Tarquinius (*OF* 29.28.2 and 30.1). The Inquisition of Ferrara suggests correction, not suppression, of the lines that identify God as a character and speaker. Only God's name was to be removed; the speech itself was preserved, becoming the speech of another character. The Inquisition does not explain the measures recommended in its *Correttione* but, as Galletti's censorship contains comments on the same passage, he might lead us further.

---

77 See the censorship of *Gigante Morante*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 320v: "Libro del Gigante Morante in ottava rima, Venetiae, 1569, ineptissimo e mendacissimo. Si ha da correggere: . . . D'una santa herba l'hebbe communicato." For Frachetta see Sberlati, *Il genere e la disputa*, 212.

What mattered to Galletti was God's praise of Isabella's deed, as it implied praise for Lucretia. Ariosto has God deliver promises that were not fulfilled, thus creating a picture of God that did not match the Catholic one. Galletti therefore deemed the passage in need of correction:

> Nel medesmo canto introduce il Poeta Idio che lodi l'atto d'Isabella, già moglie di Zerbino, (e non è dubbio che rubbò egli l'historia d'Eufrasia) ma in questo merita biasmo, perché introduce sua divina maestà a lodar l'atto di Lucretia:
> E disse più di quella ti commendo
> la cui morte a Tarquinio il Regno tolse. (*OF* 29.28.3–4)
>
> Quel che dice nella seguente stanza non s'ha da tolerare, perché introduce Idio prometter cose, che poi non si osservano:
> Per l'avvenir vuol, che ciascuna ch'habbia
> il nome tuo, sia di sublime ingegno,
> e sia bella, gentil, cortese, e saggia. (*OF* 29.29.1–3)[78]

Another example of the suppression of the Christian God is found in canto 7. God is not mentioned for his own sake, yet his name serves to explain that Ruggiero is venerated like God in Alcina's realm. God is not introduced and shaped as a character in a manner compatible with his role in the Catholic faith; only his name is used to describe the veneration of Ruggiero, a mortal character. The unique, superior role of the Christian God is ignored, and the veneration of Ruggiero is likened to idolatry, verging on abuse from a censor's standpoint.

> Da tutti gli altri tanto onore e tante
> riverenzie fur fatte al guerrier forte,
> che non ne potrian far più, se tra loro
> fosse Dio sceso dal superno coro. (*OF* 7.9.5–8)

Things look different in canto 14, where Ariosto introduces the Christian God as a character that intervenes in the story. The Christian God listens to the prayer of Charlemagne, in which he is asked to support the Christians in their battle against the Saracens. By means of direct speech, God charges Archangel St Michael to send Silence to the Christian army to facilitate their attack, and Discord to the enemy army to arouse discord (*OF* 14.75–77.5). This scene is criticized neither by the Inquisition of Ferrara nor by Galletti, notwithstanding

78 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

its fictionality. One reason may be that this image of God matched the contemporary Counter-Reformation one by idealizing God, thereby serving as Counter-Reformation propaganda. Together with the censorships of Guarini and Marcello, this example illustrates conditions under which God could be acceptable as a character in fictional texts.

To conclude, the censors' comments show the desire to sort out and shape the supernatural marvelous rather than apply a "prohibition of wonders." In their view the marvelous was not homogeneous material. They recognized that poets mingled elements from the Christian and pagan cults. As censors, they attempted to distinguish between elements such as the divine miraculous, pagan magic, sorcery and witchcraft. One way they did so was by reexamining the boundaries between Catholic 'truth' and 'reality' and fantasy in poetry.

4.2.3 *Objects and Places*

The marvelous and supernatural appear also in other poetic dimensions: objects said to possess magical powers such as weapons, rings, tools and objects of occult rituals; books containing superstitious knowledge; and places such as the afterworld or those considered to be part of this world yet sacred. The *Furioso* and Dante's *Divina Commedia* are examples of works examined by censors due to their inclusion of such objects and places.

Marvelous magical objects received little attention in the censorships of the *Furioso*. This is unexpected due to the importance of the objects to the storyline. Magical weapons, such as the sword Balisarda, were used by Christian knights to defend themselves. A magical ring and shield played prominent roles, and Ariosto wrote of spell books that broke spells. Oddly, these objects were not mentioned in the censorships by Galletti and the Inquisition of Ferrara; Galletti only points to a relatively brief description of objects used in occult rituals in canto 5 of the *Cinque canti*:

> dove imagini sacre, sacre carte,
> sacri altar, pietre sacre e sacri vasi,
> et altre cose appartinenti all'arte (*CC* 5.23.3–5)

Here, Ariosto refers to images, papers, stones, vessels, altars and other objects said to pertain to the magic arts, and described as sacred ("sacri"). Although the list is short, Galletti insisted on its elimination. He defined it as a great temerity of the author ("gran temerità dell'autore") to describe such objects, most likely because the descriptions contained too much information regarding occult rituals, and had the potential to inspire readers to procure similar objects in order to carry out occult rituals themselves. The word "temerity" recalls the term "temerarius," one of the theological degrees ("gradus") used in

inquisitorial and censorial practice to grade sinful propositions ("propositiones"). The term is explained by Inquisitor Arnaldo Albertino in his manual *De agnoscendis assertionibus. Temerarious* is the fourth grade or category signifying the maintenance of something which cannot be proven, and to act according to one's will. Albertino provides the example of maintaining that the world would end in a hundred years.[79]

Galletti also tried to grade poetic content according to theological terms as an instrument of inquisitorial practice. He found Ariosto's depiction to be sinful but not heretical. How sinful he deemed temerity becomes apparent in another scene where he observes a temerarious thought ("pensier temerario") in the encounter between Archangel St Michael and the allegories Fraud and Discord in canto 14, which he believed contained a distorted depiction of the archangel.[80] The same expression was employed by Barrio in his judgment of Petrarch. Barrio refers to the poet as "a temerarious and shameless man" ("temerarius et impudentissimus homo") because of his sonnets (*RVF* 114; 136; 137; 138), which criticize the Curia in Avignon.[81] These judgments may give an idea of the degree of sinfulness that Galletti and others perceived in the neutral or positive depiction of superstition. This aspect should be acknowledged because superstition was often tolerated in poetry, as expurgated poetic works show.

Literary places often played important roles in poetry and censorship through the profanation of a sacred place by means of occult rituals, the abuse of religious language, and other forms of mingling of the sacred and profane, as seen in censorships of the *Furioso* and Dante. In addition to the earlier examples of "cemetery" and "church", another example is "paradise". "Paradise" was used with both literal and metaphorical meanings, so the simple censorship of a place name restricted the freedom of language, style and content. The Inquisition of Ferrara deleted it in *OF* 6.72.8,[82] where the poet used it to describe the realm of Alcina:

> Queste, con molte offerte e con buon viso,
> Ruggier fecero entrar nel paradiso:
> che si può ben così nomar quel loco,
> ove mi credo che nascesse Amore. (*OF* 6.72.7–73.2)

79 Cf. Albertino, 16v.

80 See Appendix, doc. 1.4e and below Ch. 6.4.

81 Ibid., doc. 1.3b.

82 Ibid., doc. 1.5a.

In the subsequent stanza the poet explains that he chose the word because it seemed appropriate to describe the place where he believed Love was born. This explanation makes his abuse of the word even more obvious from the censorial point of view. It was most likely considered even more dangerous for readers able to imitate the poet and use the word in a similar way, thus becoming guilty of profanity themselves.

The metaphorical use of "paradise" was also censored in canto 7. The censors from Ferrara recommended that it be deleted; here, it is used metaphorically to describe the happiness caused by listening to Alcina's sweet laughter (*OF* 7.13.8):

> Sotto quel sta, quasi fra due vallette,
> la bocca sparsa di natio cinabro;
> quivi due filze son di perle elette,
> che chiude et apre un bello e dolce labro:
> quindi escon le cortesi parolette
> da render molle ogni cor rozzo e scabro;
> quivi si forma quel suave riso,
> ch'apre a sua posta in terra il paradiso. (*OF* 7.13)

Lines 7 and 8 of the fifteenth stanza were also to be deleted because they describe the physical beauty of Alcina as angelic and originating in heaven. The censors suppressed a quote from Petrarch's *Canzoniere* (*RVF* 270.84: "angelica sembianza"): "Gl'angelici sembianti nati in cielo" (*OF* 7.15.7).[83]

How the fictional Earthly Paradise and Moon of the *Furioso* were judged is not clear. The Inquisition of Ferrara recommended the suppression of the entire canto 34. Not even the description of Paradise as "le contrade sante" (*OF* 38.26.4) was to be tolerated. It is likely that the non-Christian design of Earthly Paradise was one reason for the suppression of canto 34; in addition, censors developed a suspicion of polysemous poetry in which they sensed dangerous, heterodox ideas as well as a kind of cryptic writing strategy of disguise or camouflage. This will be discussed later.

In Dante's fictional afterworld of the *Divina Commedia*, poetic licence, fiction, imitation of classical models, Sacred Scripture and the Church Fathers' writings combine. The afterworld has a far more important role and is more developed than in the *Furioso*, garnering more attention. This might also be due to the skills and interests of this critical reader. Again it was Barrio who, while assessing the sacred poem, formed an opinion of its places. His critique

83 Ibid.

is part of his *Pro lingua latina* which, as early as 1554, contained strict judgments on the Three Crowns and other vernacular poets. His critique was not a censorship written for an examination by the censorial authorities, but Barrio included a considerable portion of the judgment in his later censorship presented to the Congregation for the Index or Cardinal Sirleto.

Barrio begins by classifying Dante as a poet and person. According to Barrio, Dante had followed the customs of plebeian writers by appearing barbarian, and writing inappropriate and impious things: "... praeter quod magnam barbariem redolet, specie poesis multas ineptias atque impietates effuciit."[84] One reason for this assessment was Dante's description of an afterlife location which he referred to as 'Limbo' and 'the Elysian fields'. Barrio maintains that this rendering contravened the dogma of the Catholic faith ("Nam contra catholicae fidei dogma in alia vita locum quendam scribit, quem ipse limbum et elisios campos nuncupat.").[85] It was in *Inferno* 4, Hell, that Dante drew a unique picture of Limbo, departing from common contemporary Catholic depictions. There, Virgil and Dante as pilgrim encounter not only children who had died without baptism, but also female and male adult pagans. These pagans are not suffering from any physical pain. Forever sighing, they express a yearning for a salvation they know they will never receive. They appear in groups, some of them identified as honorable people ("orrevol gente," *Inf.* 4.72) located in a privileged place, where light overcomes darkness. There is a noble castle ("nobile castello," *Inf.* 4.106–111) surrounded by seven walls, a river, and a green garden. This abode recalls the Elysian Fields described by the ancient Roman poet Virgil. In the *Inferno*, the character Virgil explains to Dante that these "spiriti" are pagans who have not sinned in life; rather, they lacked baptism, "the door of faith" ("che è porta de la fede," *Inf.* 4.36; cf. Acts 14:27), and had not worshipped God properly ("adorar debitamente a Dio," *Inf.* 4.38). Their merits had not sufficed to save them, so their souls would remain in Limbo when Christ delivered the Hebrew Fathers.[86]

---

84 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 417–8. For an extensive study of the novelties in Dante's Limbo see Giorgio Padoan, *Il pio Enea, l'empio Ulisse. Tradizione classica e intendimento medievale in Dante* (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1977). Cf. Kenelm Foster, *The Two Dantes and other Studies* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1977); A. Iannucci, 'Dante's Limbo at the Margins of Orthodoxy', in *Dante and the Unorthodox*, ed. James Miller (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2005), 63–82.

85 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 418.

86 Cf. Iannucci, 67–9. Anna Maria Chiavacci Leonardi cites another version of the verse *Inf.* 4.36: "ch'è parte della fede che tu credi" ("which is part of the faith which you hold"). This difference seems of importance for the question of the pagans' salvation, see Dante, *Divina Commedia* (Milan: Mondadori, 1991–97), commentary on *Inf.* 4.36.

As several studies have shown, the idea that pagan adults could remain in Limbo, neither condemned to Hell nor saved, was a poetic and theological novelty that deviated from contemporary teachings.[87] This was observed by Barrio, and is an aspect he readdressed in his 1570s censorship, emphasizing that the pagans had been left there whereas the Hebrew fathers had been saved.[88] His comments in *Pro lingua latina* offer more detailed information. Barrio clearly distances himself from the naming and geographical description of Limbo as well as from that of other afterworld locations. He makes it clear that his references to the names of poetic places are based on those used by Dante. He does not consider the possibility of an allegorical interpretation, probably because he generally denies the necessity of an allegorical reading of profane literary texts.[89] His observation that Dante had conceived a place similar to the Virgilian Elysian Fields suggests that he recognized Virgil's *Aeneid* as a possible source for Dante's imaginary Limbo. This heterodox poetic rendering of Limbo was Barrio's first example illustrating how Dante mingled the Catholic with a pagan cult or, to consider it slightly differently, how Dante mingled the sacred and the profane.

Barrio seemed irritated by the fact that pagan men and women were also named, but what he judged to be a serious problem was the method by which they were punished. Dante had them suffer mentally because their longing for salvation would never be realized (*Inf.* 4.28–30). As Kenelm Foster shows, this idea reflects St Bonaventure's teaching that unbaptized children in Limbo have the knowledge that they will never attain eternal salvation and divine beatitude. Dante apparently assimilated the fate of pagans with that of unbaptized children in Limbo, using Bonaventure's teaching for poetic *inventio*. Poetic invention, however, was by then bound to the Catholic faith; Barrio therefore judged Dante's representation of the pagans to be a heretical deviation from Catholic truth.

Barrio fully understood that Dante had placed pagans in Limbo, Purgatory and Paradise in order to highlight their merits in life. He observes that the pagans in Limbo distinguished themselves in "certain disciplines or arms" ("aliqua disciplina aut armis"), and that they were placed in *Purgatorio* and *Paradiso* according to Dante's own assessments ("Animas, quas suo arbitratu in purgatorio et paradiso locat . . ."). Likewise, Barrio was suspicious of the pagan Trojan Ripheus in *Paradiso* (*Par.* 20.67–69), suggesting that Ripheus's virtue might have been justice, for Virgil calls him "iustissimus" in his *Aeneid*. It seems

87 Cf. Foster, 169. Cf. Padoan.

88 See Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

89 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 418 and 403.

as if Barrio felt that through such justice Ripheus could be perceived as competing with Christ. Emperor Trajan, also mentioned in *Paradiso* 20, was not taken into account.[90] This might indicate that Barrio had known the ancient legend of Trajan returning to life after death through the prayers of a pope before converting to Catholicism and being saved.[91]

Whereas early commentators of the poem tried to defend Dante by explaining that he wrote as a poet, not as a theologian,[92] Barrio obviously did not grant Dante or other poets any kind of poetic licence, nor did he accept poetic distortions of the Catholic truth. In *Pro lingua latina*, he accentuates that it was improper for any Christian, be he a poet, philosopher, astrologer, or expert of any other discipline, to feel or teach anything that went against the Christian faith. He should not lie, detract others, deride Christian doctrine or convert sacred "things" or ecclesiastical dogmas into profane tales.[93]

Using his judgment, Barrio applied the censorship principle previously formulated in *Inter eadem sacrosancta*, according to which the sacred should not be mingled with or stained by the profane.[94] The motive behind this principle may not only have been reverence for and protection of the sacred; there may have been a didactic purpose. This becomes evident in St Antoninus's criticism of the *Commedia* in his *Chronicles*.[95] Allowing literary texts which deviated from the teachings of the Church was considered dangerous for uneducated readers who were susceptible to believing such representations to be true. It was therefore necessary for the design of poetic locations to coincide with contemporary Catholic belief.

4.3 Marvel and Fate

How did censors of poetry explain pagan elements of fate that did not harmonize with the Catholic faith: as fiction, heresy, poetic language or a writing technique to inspire marvel? We know that supernatural forces of fate were rigorously censored, but each case was different. Some censors became caught between interpretations, while others dug deeply into the semantic structures

90 Ibid. 418–9.

91 Traian is mentioned in Barrio's censorship, see Appendix, doc. 1.3g. On the legend, see Foster, 183–4.

92 Cf. Iannucci, 64, 67 and 70.

93 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 403.

94 Cf. the decree *Insuper eadem sacrosancta*, Fragnito, 'Aspetti e problemi'.

95 Cf. Iannucci, 65; St Antoninus, part. 3, tit. 21, ch. 5, para. 2.

of a text in order to convict a poet of heresy. As a result, poets trod cautiously in their dealings with such material. Before exploring censorship files we shall first take a look at an event that took place at the end of the sixteenth century in order to put subsequent censorial criticism and the implications of censorship on poetry into a clearer perspective.

In 1600, a volume of love poetry written by two Venetian poets, Celio Magno and Orsatto Giustinian, appeared in Venice. A manuscript containing drafts for this edition shows that Magno carefully worked out the printer's preface to the reader, *Lo stampatore a' lettori*. Its original title was *Prefatione ai lettori circa le parole*, and it explains the poets' language.[96] The preface begins by explaining the words "fate" ("fato"), "destiny" ("destino"), "fortune" ("fortuna"), "lot" ("sorte") and other similar vocabulary pertaining to the common way of speaking ("frequentate dell'uso del commun parlare") used especially in poetry ("et spetialmente ne' versi dei Poeti"). Magno immediately refers to the potential danger of understanding the words "destiny" and "fate" in a way which would contravene the Catholic faith ("perchè potrebbe alcuno peraventura riceverle come scritte in qualche senso diverso dalla verità de i dogmi della Santissima Religion nostra Catholica Romana"). He states that they are part of common human language ("la commune humana favella") and thus also part of writing ("dallo scrivere et spetialmente versi"). In obedience to the Inquisition, he and Giustinian had used them only because it was customary among poets to ornament poetic expression. There was no other intention behind this ("non hanno havuto altra intentione, che l'uso et l'ornamento della locutione Poetica"). The purpose was to make poetry marvelous and to give the reader pleasure. Magno also clarifies the meaning of the words, explaining that they signify the "second cause" that was subject to God, who uses them to realize his providence and operate according to his will. The words do not refer to other superior beings with the power to reign over human actions, thoughts and the *liberum arbitrium*.[97]

Magno makes an important point here. He explains that his and Giustinian's intention was to depict the truth and the instability of coincidences of everyday life.[98] He presents this material as a poetic means of naming and illustrating what usually escapes human imagination. This becomes clear in the draft *Prefatione ai lettori circa le parole*:

---

96 Cf. Celio Magno, *Ai lettori*, in Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 171 (6092), 1r (title page: 2v); cf. *Lo stampatore a' Lettori*, in Magno and Orsatto Giustinian, *Rime*, con licenza de' Superiori, et privilegio (Venice: Andrea Muschio, 1600).

97 See Magno, *Ai lettori*, 1r, cf. *Lo stampatore a' Lettori*.

98 Ibid.

> Si troveranno in diversi luoghi di questi ~~duo~~ volumi di Rime le voci di fato, destino, fortuna, et altre simiglianti, frequentate dell'uso del commun parlare e specialmente ne' versi de Poeti, come quei, che per li precetti della loro Arte sogliono ~~adornar~~ vestir il falso col verisimile ~~versar intorno a favole~~ et più, che altri usare le figure, dar senso alle cose inanimate, et suppor le cose impossibili, et ~~con le hiperboli, et altri simili~~, con altre cose fatte <…> modi ornare et ~~far~~ rendere meravigliose i concetti et le parole loro ~~per partorire il diletto, colquale più facilmente si conduce huomo al fin principale, che deono havere i Poeti del giovare~~.[99]

Magno was not only a poet but also secretary to the Council of the Ten, the highest juridical tribunal of Venice, which also granted printing privileges. He was a good friend of Venier's and frequented the literary circles of Venice. Edoardo Taddeo has already pointed out that Magno's editorial work on his *Rime* was influenced by the climate of the Counter-Reformation.[100] It would be surprising to find that he had not been familiar with censorship criteria. It is significant that at the end of the century poets tried to use fictionality, poetic expression and manners of writing as explanations and defences for their works. They were exactly the same points that some censors considered as possible explanations for deviations from the faith.

Magno and Giustinian were right to defend themselves because *Rule* IX of the *Index* prohibits depictions in which the freedom of human will is subordinate to superstitious forces. A similar instruction was also expressed by the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum*, which ordains that everything subordinating the freedom of human will to fate, false signs and pagan fortune is to be erased from public memory ("Item quaecumque fato, aut fallacibus signis, aut ethnicae fortunae, humani arbitrii libertatem subiiciunt, obliterentur.").[101] This instruction calls to mind rigorously expurgated books in which words such as "fortune" and "fate" are blacked out, yet as *Rule* IX states, this instruction applies to depictions that do not respect the freedom of human will, and the censorial documents show that this was indeed a crucial aspect worthy of consideration during the assessment of poetic works. There is no mention of poetic language and ornament or fictionality in *Rule* IX, although motives for depicting supernatural forces of fate were considered during the assessment. Aesthetic aspects were also discussed, as were matters of faith,

99 Ibid. The corrections are by Magno.

100 See Edoardo Taddeo, *Il manierismo letterario e i lirici veneziani del tardo Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974).

101 Cf. *Instructio de correctione librorum*, *Index* of 1596, in *ILI*, ix, §ii.

from venial sin to heresy, as indicated in the judgments on *Diana* by Jorge de Montemayor, love lyrics by Petrarch and his imitators and Dante's *Commedia*.

Not all poets were treated equally. The above form of censorship applied to Catholic poets, particularly those who were distinguished from classical pagan poets. Non-Christian beliefs in fate as described by classical poets as well as other concepts of fate and human will were respected and tolerated, but Catholic poets were expected to adjust their ideas to the Catholic doctrines of *liberum arbitrium* and divine providence as defined at the Council of Trent. In September 1596, the Dominican Convent di Santo Andrea of Faenza published an instruction for teachers in the humanistic studies which vividly expresses this policy:

> Lettori e maestri d'Humanità.
> Sì come i libri latini antichi de' Gentili, che ex professo trattano cose lascive, si permettono per l'eleganza del parlare, ma non si devono leggere a Putti; così quelli che leggono, et insegnano lettere humane, saranno avvertiti, che nel leggere e dichiarare gli Antichi Gentili, debbano ammonire i Scolari a discostarsi dalla fortuna e dal fato, che sottopongono il libero arbitrio et all'altre cose, che sanno di Paganesmo.
> Dato nel Convento di Santo Andrea di Faenza questo dì primo di Settembre 1596.
> F. Pius Ioanninus <. . .>.
> In Bologna, presso gli Heredi di Giovanni Rossi 1596.[102]

The instruction was based on *Rule* VII of the *Index* of 1564, according to which works by pagan authors containing lascivious or obscene "things" (*Rule* VII, *Index* 1564) could be permitted for the sake of the elegance of the Latin and Greek languages, but should not be read to young people. The privilege was also granted to works containing heterodox utterances about fate and fortune. Teachers were admonished to explain pagan beliefs and to urge students to distance themselves from concepts in which free will was subjugated to pagan deities.

Things appeared different in works by Catholic poets. Censorships and related documents of the Congregation for the Index show that texts were searched for the words "fate," "fortune," and "destiny" as well as expressions from the same word families. Censors listed passages in which these and similar supernatural forces were introduced and, in most cases, gave a first judgment. The Congregation's secretary Bonardo addressed this procedure in his

102 Cf. Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVIII, 20v–1r.

Discorso intorno all'Indice da farsi de libri prohibiti in 1587, only a few years before the Congregation began its work on the Clementine *Index*:

> Nell'espurgar si vogliono levar via tutte le prohibitioni heretiche, suspette, et scandalose, tutte le cose superstitiose, contrarie a buoni costumi, li nomi degli heretici, quelle cose che inducono gli'huomini ad attribuire troppo o a Cieli o alla fortuna o fato et simili altre, le maledicenze massime d'ecclesiastici et Principi . . .[103]

Much weight was placed on the ideas an author tried to communicate, the manner in which he dealt with the material, and how he presented it. A first impression emerges from a censorship of Michel de Montaigne's *Essais* which was instigated by Sisto Fabri, master of the sacred palace. The censor accuses Montaigne of speaking of Fortune profanely, like pagans ("profani et ethnici").[104] At first glance, the focus is on Montaigne, but a closer look shows that it is actually on Montaigne's way of dealing with Fortune and destiny by giving the pagan deity an inappropriate role in a text by an author believed to be Christian.[105] In his account of the censorship and interrogation that took place in Rome on 15 April 1581, Montaigne does not give much thought to the criticism; he mentions that he was expected to correct his work and delete, among other things, the word "Fortune" ("les mots de Fortune"). Either he was trying to be brief, or he was not fully aware of the reason for the censorship and the difference between the use of a word and the idea behind it; possibly he did not consider the difference to be important.[106]

Other examples can be found in Paolo Giovio's *Historiarum sui temporis libri* (1550–1552) and Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque fortunae*. These works were addressed in a *Memoriale* according to which a congregation of monks and mendicants were to be summoned to correct the works of the Church Fathers. Giovio, the document states, "attributes" everything to fortune and fate: "Historiae Iovij, qui omnia ferae fortune tribuit et fato." Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque fortunae* did not figure in the *Index* or additional blacklists drawn up in Rome. Nevertheless, it was considered in the *Memoriale* because Fortune is mentioned in the title. The *Memoriale* suggests that the words "fate"

103 Cf. Appendix, doc. 2.2.

104 On the censorship of Montaigne see Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 341.

105 Ibid.

106 See Michel de Montaigne, *Journal de Voyage en Italie par la Suisse et l'Allemagne en 1580 et 1581*, ed. Maurice Rat (Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères, 1942), 133–4 (entry dated 15 April 1581).

and "fortune" should be prohibited ("inhibendum esset"), quoting Augustine as an authority.[107] A judgment on Giuseppe Betussi's translation of Boccaccio's *De mulieribus claris* quotes a passage that overtly confirms the influence of the stars over man's appetite: "Tutto ch'io mi creda che gl'influssi de cieli siano quelli che reggono gli appetiti . . . Carta 159."[108] The same can be observed in censorships of collections of vernacular letters concerning a letter by Francesco della Torre (ed. Venice: Paolo Gherardo, 1545) and one by Lodovico Dolce (ed. Venice: Aldo Manuzio, 1564).[109] In regard to chapter 29 of the second book of Niccolò Machiavelli's *Discorsi della prima decade di Tito Livio*, his censor Roberto di Roberti suggests:

> 'La fortuna accieca l'animi degl'homini' / tutto il capitolo attribuisce alla fortuna quel che si deve alla providentia e par che sia absoluta governatrice delle attioni humane però levarei il nome della fortuna e lo darrei tutto a causa più vera.[110]

By contrast, how the value of poetic language and fictionality was considered emerges from the anonymous censorship of Jorge de Montemayor's *Diana*. It collates a number of bibliographical references to passages in which the word *fatum* is mentioned. The censor just observes that Montemayor mentions fate, leaving the interpretation to the authorities who would receive his censorship and decide upon further proceedings: "Fatum nominat fol. 14.a. lin. 5. et 23.a. lin.3. et 30.b. lin.15. et 40. a. lin.5. et 41.b. lin.10. et. 56.a. lin.23. et 89.a. lin.45. et 157.a. lin.11. et 204.b. et 221.b. lin.ult."[111] Even though he did not give a judgment on the suspect passages, he described his impression of the work.

Diana's censor points out that the indicated contents are only "fabulous things" ("res fabulosae"), elements of a story, and therefore not of great importance ("magni momenti"). He explains that in Spanish, *fatum* can refer to *sors* or *fortuna*, perhaps suggesting that the passages could be interpreted in a way conforming to the Catholic faith. In his view, the fictional nature of the story and the use of Spanish could mitigate the potential danger inherent in the

107 Cf. *Memoriale*, in Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, 175r–v, 175v.

108 Cf. *Censura nel libro del Boccaccio delle donne Illustri*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 367r.

109 See Appendix, doc. 1.11c–d.

110 Cf. *Censura sopra i discorsi di Nicolo Machiavelli*, fatta dal illustre Signor Roberto di Roberti conservatore del inclito popolo Romano all'anno 1587, da ordine del molto Reverendo Signor il Maestro del Sacro Palazzo, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 187r–9v, 188v.

111 See *In septem libros Dianae Georgij de Montemaior et in secundam partem Gasparis Egidij Polo Censura*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 368r.

depiction of *fatum*. He points to the elegance of the Spanish language ("elegantia sermonis"), bringing attention to the aesthetic and cultural value of the work which could protect it from absolute prohibition.

However, he found it difficult to deal with the mingling of fictional elements and historical facts. It made him suspicious of *Diana's* meaning and unsure how one should approach its interpretation. He was not the only censor with such difficulties. His comments recall the doubts put forward by Michele Ghislieri, who wondered whether fictional texts ought to be censored. Concluding his judgment, *Diana*'s censor returned to his initial reflection on the nature and reception of the poem, specifying that such contents could only be excused if understood in a hyperbolic sense as part of a story understood not to be true.

> Sed cum res sint fabulosae non videtur esse magni momenti, praeterque quia apud Hispanos posset his locis fatum accipi pro sorte seu fortuna unde et fol. 104.b. lin. 24. Dicit autor nec fatum ipsum posse sibi subijcere Mariae Lusitanorum regum filiae virtutem. Ut verum fatear nisi totus liber fabulam contineret dura locutio videretur . . . Haec omnia duriuscule dicerentur? neque possunt ullo pacto defendi nisi in sensu hyperbolico et in rebus fabulosis quales continentur hoc libro, quem nullo modo supprimendum existimarem propterea quod hic auctor tanta Hispani sermonis elegantia polluit . . .[112]

Not all censors were willing to excuse poetry. The anonymous censor of love lyrics by Petrarch and Petrarchists was able to explain renderings of superstitious material by considering fictionality and the habit of poetic writing as factors, but such factors in his eyes did not make sinful depictions in poetry excusable. The censor maintained that destiny and the influence of the stars could be found in nearly all vernacular poems, and that the poets responsible for these works claimed to have been predestined by the stars to include such content, referring to the stars as "iniquitous" and "cruel." The censor defined such remarks as "nonsense full of errors." This concept contravened the Catholic faith by depicting man's will as unfree:

> È cosa ordinaria et quasi comune a tutti i Poeti volgari di lodar tanto soverchiamente la lor Donna, che se non la fanno un Dio, non gli pare haver fatto niente . . . Oltra di questo hanno per costume d'attribuir sempre ogni loro vanità al cielo, alle stelle, al fato, al destino: di modo che se essi errano dicono essere sforzati a così fare et ch'è più colpa del cielo et

112 Ibid.

> del destino che sua: Et per questo molte volte chiamano le stelle fiere, i fati iniqui et crudeli. Che sono tutte certe loro sciocchezze piene d'errori.[113]

By referring to this manner of writing about destiny as a "custom" ("costume") of vernacular poets, this censor made a significant remark. He did not literally conclude that the poets were expressing their personal religious convictions; rather, he considered their manner of writing to be a poetic form, although he did not explicitly speak of "style" or, as did other censors, discuss the correct use of "language." In his eyes, this approach to writing may have been motivated by the desire to make poetry special, a piece of art, in the same way as poets modeled female characters after goddesses. To consider such depictions of destiny as a poetic form, however, required an awareness of the fictionality of love lyrics, or *favole*. This censor may have applied severe judgment due to the significance of words; it was words that counted for this censor, not unlike Barrio's judgment on Sannazaro's *Arcadia*.

The danger of poetic depictions of supernatural forces of destiny was taken more seriously in demonology. In his treatise on exorcism, *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica*, Menghi describes a superstitious belief according to which the existence of "malefici," witches and wizards, was due to the influence of the stars, planets and other celestial forces. In accordance with the *Index* he adds that this belief denies the freedom of creatures endowed with reason ("creature ragionevoli"), and he defines the belief as "fiction" ("fittioni"); more precisely, poetic fiction ("fittioni Poetiche").

This definition raises the question of whether he considered such a belief to be fiction similar to poetry, or whether he considered poetry to be the source of the belief. If the latter is true, Menghi blamed poetry for the diffusion of heterodox ideas. He held that this kind of superstitious belief arose from the desire ("il volere") to deny one's own responsibility for a crime by ascribing it to an imagined fate (orig. "fingono"), a kind of demon or deity referred to as "the Three Fates" ("Parche"), or "fate" ("fato"). Menghi explains that the Three Fates are mortal women described in classical drama. He even provides details, indicating the first song of the choir in Seneca's first tragedy, perhaps referring to Seneca's *Hercules furens*.

It may be surprising to note that the exorcist Menghi utilized poetry in his treatise on exorcism, even including bibliographical references. The reason becomes immediately clear: If fate exists, he posits, referring to Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, then it must be understood to be God's "will" ("volere"). He blames poets for having originated a disbelief in goddesses of fate ("Percioché

113 See Appendix, doc. 1.2a.

i Poeti hanno ditto che le Fate sono tre sorelle chiamate da loro come di sopra Parche . . .”). He includes a brief description of the Three Fates Clotho, Lachesis and Atropos and emphasizes that this “invention” (“fittione”) had spread to such an extent that the Three Fates were believed to truly appear to humans, answer their questions and make infallible promises. Therefore, in Menghi’s treatise on exorcism, poetry is declared a danger to orthodoxy, a pernicious source and vehicle of superstition.[114]

Even if fictionality and poetic form come into play in various assessments, the files show that depicted beliefs in destiny were closely examined. The *Avertimento* on vernacular poetry provides insight into a censor’s attempt to perform a complex reading of Petrarchist works. This censor attempted to penetrate the semantic structure of the examined texts and identify the concept of destiny. He sought matters of faith. This judgment provides insight into Constabile’s May prohibition of poetic genres or sub-genres of a lascivious and dishonest nature because it was one of the decisive factors that supported it (May 1574). An example is given of a very bad sentence (“sentenza pessima”) identified in lines by Ariosto:

> 27.1. in fine. O di noi più non curano, o non hanno
> qua giù più forza, o degli nostri casi
> quei che reggono il ciel giù poco sanno.
> Che non vi siano anchor crederei quasi. (*A R Capitoli* 6.22–25)[115]

These lines appear to express the lover’s doubts about the justice of fate. The lover explains that heaven is ruled by forces that do not rule life on earth either because they do not wish to or because they are not able to. God and divine providence are not mentioned here, the implication being that they are not part of the lover’s view of the world. More verses are quoted which serve to prove the introductory observations of the *Avertimento* in which the lover denies his ability to change his destiny, blaming destiny for his sins rather than taking responsibility:

> 37.2.9. La mia Dea (= *A R Capitoli* 18.39)
> 7.1.5. Credendo poi che più potesse l’uso
> che ’l destin . . . (= *A R Canzoni* 1.37–8)

114 Cf. Menghi, *Compendio dell’arte essorcistica*, 253–5. On Augustine, see id., *De civitate Dei*, v, 8.

115 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2b. I am quoting from Ariosto, *Rime*, in id., *Opere minori*, ed. C. Segre (Milan: Ricciardi, 1954), hereafter *A R*.

11.1.12. Ma più che giusta elettione, il mio
fiero destin ho da imputar, s'io fallo. (= *A R Sonetti* 16.10–11)[116]

Barrio criticized Ariosto for similar reasons. Barrio observed that Ariosto questioned the justice of the Christian God in the *Furioso* by punishing Adam and Eve for their disobedience: In Earthly Paradise the English knight Astolfo eats fruits offered to him by the saints John, Elias and Enoch. He then states that the forbidden fruit of Paradise eaten by Adam and Eve must have been so sweet that it had been impossible for them to obey God's precept. In Barrio's censorship of the *Furioso* this passage is used to prove the danger of Protestant ideas hidden in the poem.[117]

Barrio submitted this censorship to Sirleto, calling Ariosto an imitator of Petrarch. It was accompanied by censorships of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, which, among other things, dealt with destiny. Received by Sirleto, the head of the Congregation for the Index, these observations may well have led to further investigation of vernacular lyric poetry, especially on love. The thematic analogies between *Avertimento* and Barrio's censorships and the focus of the former on superstitious elements pertaining to the theme of destiny suggest that the two examinations were connected, as they were both written in the early 1570s, perhaps before Constabile's May prohibition.[118]

Further evidence in Bembo and Sannazaro was uncovered by the anonymous censor. Bembo draws an image of the immutability of destiny confronting the lover, or, more broadly, man:

Ma piè mosso dal ciel nulla distorna. (= *B R* 94.14)
Lasso, ben veggio homai, sì com'è duro
fuggir quel che di noi su nel ciel piacque,
né pote huom dal suo fato esser mai lungi. (= *B R* 98.12–4)
Poi piacque al ciel, cui contrastar non vale. (= *B R* 99.3)

Two other lines quoted by the censor read:

dispose ch'io v'amassi,
et dielmi in fato (= *B R* 38.3–4)[119]

116 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2b.
117 Ibid. doc. 1.3h.
118 On the possible relation between the two documents see Appendix, introduction to doc. 1.3.
119 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2c, on Sannazaro, cf. 1.2e.

One may assume that Bembo was expressing a pagan idea of fate, but the quotation is incomplete. The subject of the verb "dispose" is missing. A glimpse at the preceding line is necessary to determine who or what is the subject. The author of the *Avertimento* accompanied all quotations with bibliographical notes, so that his criticisms could be verified. He apparently expected his readers to examine his judgment and the texts. In so doing they would have found that it was not the stars determining the lover's life, but the Christian God:

> l'alta cagion, che da principio diede
> a le cose create ordine e stato (= *B R* 38.1–2)

Fate is identified as a metaphor used to discuss the lover's destiny.[120] But if God stood behind this picture, why was the passage censored? One might assume that this interpretation conformed to the widespread approach to the pagan deity Fortune found in *De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris* by Cardinal Agostino Valier. Valier explains that in poetry the pagan deity represents divine providence.[121] Thus, the anonymous censor must have found something else in Bembo's lines which did not harmonize with his faith.

God's role as 'fate' does not become immediately clear in the *Rime*, so that, outside the context of poems such as sonnet *B R* 38, fate could be understood to be a supernatural pagan force, a potential danger to readers. To understand God as the author of an immutable fate was to imply that God denied free will. This perspective sheds a different light on the censor's three quotations. Heaven ("il cielo") might represent God. If the lover believes he is predestined to love, he also believes he is incapable of not loving unless heaven, or God, wills it. In the censor's eye this reading suggests the denial of man's free will, and its censorship would be in accordance with the Council of Trent, in which the council fathers decreed that Protestant ideas of predestination were to be rejected.[122]

In Sannazaro's *Rime* the roles of fate and the stars turn out to be rather complex. Passages are quoted which, at first sight, appear to describe the cruelty of the stars and fate ("fato"): "27.2.3. [Ahi fortuna nemica,] Ahi fera stella" (*S R* 20.9), "12.1.16. O fere stelle homai datemi pace" *S R* 33.13), "19.2.9. Ahi sorte, ahi crudo fato" (*S R* 53.23), "31.1.11. Pur c'habbia fin mio fato acerbo et rio" (*S R* 81.8). Amor, Fortuna and heaven dominate the lover in the literal sense: "15.1.34. Sì mi governa Amor, Fortuna, e'l cielo" (*S R* 41.68), and give him his fate:

120 Cf. *B R* 1, 41, 109, 113, 116–20, 163–5, etc.

121 Valier, *De cautione adhibenda*, 7.

122 *Canones de iustificatione*, Council of Trent, in *Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien*, iii.

"19.1.9. A cui le Stelle, Amor, Fortuna e'l Fato / diedero in sorte questo sconsolato." (= *S R* 52.6–7) The lover, tormented by his unfulfilled love, turns to the stars to inquire whether the way in which heaven was treating him was a reflection of heaven's justice, and whether his destiny was the decree ("decreto") of an unchangeable law ("immota legge"). In sonnet 16 (*S R* 16.1–3) he begs the stars for peace.[123]

Unlike in Bembo, the censor does not quote passages that suggest another interpretation of the celestial forces. Sannazaro's *Rime* narrate the spiritual development of the lover; his faith, love and attitude towards himself and his life are refined. While the lover begs the stars for help in the first half of *Sonetti et canzoni*, he turns to Christ in the second half. As early as in the first half, the lover confesses to knowing that it is wrong to ascribe responsibility to the stars for his sins. He confesses to having betrayed himself, and admits to having been influenced by desire. His confession implies his awareness that superstitious belief had been an excuse and had stemmed from a wrong and impure form of love. This lover, however, is not yet strong enough to cope with this situation:

> Però, s'io piango e mi lamento spesso
> di Fortuna, d'Amore e di madonna,
> non ho ragion se non contra me stesso,
> che a guisa d'uom che vaneggiando assonna,
> mi pasco d'ombre et ho la morte appresso,
> né penso che ho a lassar la fragil gonna. (*S R* 14.9–14)

It is only at the end of *Sonetti et canzoni*, in sonnet *S R* 95, that the lover turns to God ("del cielo eterno alto motore"). He prays to him to guide his lost heart:

> Le dubbie spemi, il pianto e 'l van dolore,
> i pensier folli e le delire imprese,
> e le querele indarno al vento spese,
> m'hanno a me tolto, e posto in lungo errore.
> Ma tu, del cielo eterno alto motore,
> la cui pietà precorre a nostre offese,
> per quel non finto amor che in noi ti accese,
> drizza a buon corso il disvïato core. (*S R* 95.1–8)

One might question the necessity of censoring heterodox ideas if the lover was able to recognize his faults. What made the story worthy of censorship, from the censorial point of view, was the lover's intentional pronouncement and

123 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2e.

description of his sins and errors. Such a display of sins and errors presented a model for imitation, a danger in itself. It could be that the expression of ideas of predestination and free will, no longer acceptable after Trent, might have made the censor suspicious, as in the case of *Diana's* censor.

Heresy has not yet been discussed, but comes into play regarding Petrarch, the model of Petrarchist poetry. Barrio selected several poems from *Canzoniere* which confirmed the lover's belief in the influence of heaven and the stars upon his life, mind and feelings. What was new was that he sought to define the superstitions in a heresiological context. Quoting the lines

> Sel disse mai che venga in odio a quella
> per Rachel ho servito e non per Lia (*RVF* 206.1 and 55),

he observes that, in this particular canzone, Petrarch compares himself to the patriarch Jacob and Laura to Rachel. Petrarch claims to be compelled to love Laura, thus denying man's free will. This reminds Barrio of Priscillianism:

> Nefaria et haec comparatio. se enim iacob et lauram racheli comparat. Et gloriatur se fato, ut ipse putat, obstrictum fuisse, ut lauram periret, unde liberam hominis negat voluntatem priscillianorum more.[124]

In her introduction to Barrio's censorship, Passarelli declares that Lutheran criticism of the doctrine of *liberum arbitrium* overshadows Barrio's censorship and eliminates diachrony because Barrio pays particular attention to the themes of predestination and denial of free will. Passarelli understands Barrio's judgment to have been influenced by interests of the Counter-Reformation, that is, the fight against Protestantism.[125] In fact, it would have been odd if Barrio had not been sensitive to such ideas due to the debates and conflicts of his time. He did not, however, classify Petrarch's ideas as Protestant; rather, he referred to Priscillianism, a heresy of late antiquity dating back further than the *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*.

Barrio reminds us repeatedly that the lover complains about his fate in the *Canzoniere*, referring to the influence of the astral constellation on his life and cursing the day he was born.[126] Barrio observes parallels between ideas of the *Canzoniere* and Priscillianism. He does not claim that Petrarch was a Priscillianist, but, choosing his words carefully, he declares that Petrarch denied human free will similar to the Priscillianists ("Priscillianorum more").

124 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

125 Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*', 187.

126 See Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

His earlier comments on Petrarch and Dante published in *Pro lingua latina* had gone further because he had accused both Petrarch and Dante of Priscillianist heresy.

In Dante's case this judgment was based on the observation that, in the *Inferno* of his *Divina Commedia*, the degree of Fortune's influence upon the damned souls during their lifetime recalls a form of predamnation. Barrio maintained that the notion that not even human reason ("humana ratio") could protect man from Fortune was the equivalent of Priscillianism, the same heresy he identified in Petrarch's love poetry ("Quare hunc et Petrarcham Priscillianam haeresim lapsos fuisse liquido constat.").[127] His later censorship specifies that this criticism was based on *Inferno* 7, where Virgil explains the role of Fortune to Dante the pilgrim. Fortune is said to have been created by and subordinate to God and is assigned the role of distributing vain goods ("li ben vani," *Inf.* 7.79). Barrio quotes the lines "or puoi, figliuol, veder la corta buffa" (*Inf.* 7.61) and "Vostro saper non ha contasto a lei" (*Inf.* 7.85).[128]

Barrio's concern with this particular heresy presupposes a sound knowledge of heresiology. Such knowledge was not necessarily present in common inquisitorial manuscripts which were generally informative but not in this regard. Even Eymerich's *Directorium inquisitorum* provides a very vague explanation of this heresy, and its relationship to predestination is not made explicit.[129] Barrio most likely found information in sources such as St Augustine's *Sermo 199 In Epiphania Domini* and the homily on Matt. 2:1–12 of St Gregory the Great, for, in *Pro lingua latina*, he uses quotations from both these texts to sharpen his criticism of Petrarch's depiction of fate and the stars in *Canzoniere*. Significantly, like the anonymous author of the *Avertimento* and Menghi, Barrio holds that people "invented" ("confingant") the belief that everything happens out of necessity in order to justify their sins.[130] He may also have found an explanation of Priscillianism in Augustine's *De haeresibus*. Augustine explains that

127 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 419–20.

128 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

129 Nicholas Eymerich, *Directorium inquisitorum*, ed. Francisco Peña (Venice: Marcantonio Zaltieri, 1607), II, ch. 2, comm. 2, and ibid., 'Quaestiones quinquaginta octo de haeretica pravitate', quaest. 6 art. 54.

130 Barrio, *PLL*, 410–1, cf. Augustine, *Sermo* 199, in id., *Predigten zu Neujahr und Epiphanie* (*Sermones 196/A–204/A*) (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2010), 326; id., *De haeresibus, ad Quodvultdeum, liber unus*, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De fide invisibilium, Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et charitate, De catechizandis rudibus, Sermo ad catechumenos de symbolo, Sermo de disciplina cristiana, Sermo de utilitate ieiunii, Sermo de excidio urbis Romae, De haeresibus* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), para. 79, Gregory the Great, *Homilia X*, in id., *Homilia in Evangelia/Evangelienhomilien*, trans. Michael Fiedrowicz (Freiburg: Herder, 1997), i, 170.

Priscillianists believed that at the moment of birth each human body was intimately connected to a constellation of the stars, which ultimately influenced one's life.[131] The relationship between reason, will and astral influence, however, is not explained.[132]

Such heresy was quite common in the early Middle Ages. Bishop Priscillian of Avila had been condemned and burned as a heretic in the fourth century. In the fifth century his followers, Priscillianists, were declared a heretical sect. Francisco Peña explains that their belief system combined Gnostic, Manichean and Christian ideas.[133] At first glance, Barrio's accusation might seem misplaced or anachronistic, but Pope Sixtus V also refers to Priscillianism and Gregory the Great in his famous bull *Coeli et terrae creator* against judicial astrology, demonstrating that believing in the influence of the stars had been condemned long ago. The pope used this example to explain the suppression of superstitious beliefs being spread in the 1580s.[134] In the eyes of the Church such beliefs were the remains of an ancient form of superstitious belief which had survived through the centuries. In his use of the term in regards to Dante and Petrarch, Barrio did not deviate from sixteenth-century censorial or inquisitorial practice.

It is interesting that Barrio construed a connection between vernacular love poetry and Gnostic and Manichaen ideas in the context of heresiology; critics have repeatedly tried to prove a connection between medieval troubadour lyric poetry and Catharism, which some consider to be linked to Manicheism. The connection construed by Barrio becomes even more interesting in his censorship of the character of Laura in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, because she is likened to a goddess, recalling the Gnostic female figure of light, Sophia.

One might expect that, based on authorities, Barrio's thesis on and interpretation of Petrarch should be correct from a theological point of view. As mentioned above, Barrio attempted to show that Petrarch denied free will ("libera voluntas") and divine providence in the ten poems *RVF* 214, 264, 69, 331, 212, 29, 89, 211, 221 and 240 (Barrio's order of quotation) not

131 Augustine, *De haeresibus*, para. 70. On Priscillian of Avila, see Henry Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila. The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 35, 61–2, 138. Cf. Virginia Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic. Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 61–3.

132 Cf. by contrast Cristoforo Landino in *Dante con l'espositioni di Christoforo Landino et d'Alessandro Vellutello, sopra la sua Comedia dell'Inferno, del Purgatorio et del Paradiso* (Venice: Gio. Battista et Gio. Bernardo Sessa, frat., 1596), 44r–v.

133 Cf. Eymerich/Peña, C. 2 c. 2/88 and Q. 6 Art. 54/245: "Priscillianistae a Priscilliano vocati qui in Hispania ex errore Gnosticorum et Manicharorum permistum dogma composuit." On the Gnostics, ibid. art. 6/243, on the Manichaens, ibid. art. 31/244 and on the Cathars ibid., art. 28/244.

134 Gregory of Naples, 162v.

only because Petrarch seems to have blamed the pagan deity of love but also because Petrarch claimed to be predestined by fate to love. For instance, in canzone *RVF* 264, the lover believes himself to have been given a particular role in the world by heaven:

> che spazio mi si desse il cielo
> quando novellamente io venni in terra
> a soffrir l'aspra guerra
> che 'ncontra me medesmo seppi ordire (*RVF* 264.109–112).

In sonnet *RVF* 212 the lover explicitly blames a star for having destined him to love (*RVF* 212.14). He maintains that benign stars ("benigne stelle") had been present at the birth of Laura, endowing her with a good destiny (*RVF* 29.43–45). In *RVF* 214, Barrio finds the lover narrating that his soul, still unsure about his fatal course ("fatal suo corso," *RVF* 214.4), had entered a wood where it had been caught in the snares of a tender flower (*RVF* 214.7 and 10). This experience created new pains for the lover, a difficult path ("un duro corso," *RVF* 214.25) that he now had to take. He asks God, il "Signor," to assist him. What the document does not explain is how Barrio dealt with the fact that the lover eventually turned to God for help and how fate and God are connected in the *Canzoniere*.[135]

It is important to note that this interpretation applies to the selected ten poems, not to the entire *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*. Barrio subsequently created additional lists of poems in which he noted fate being ascribed a similar role. Each list has a comment and he left it to his readers to draw conclusions. It becomes apparent why Barrio subdivided the passages relating to fate rather than grouping them together in one section; by so doing, he drew attention to different thematic aspects of fate. His lists show interpretive approaches to the complex semantic structure of the two works. It appears that Barrio sought to single out transparent semantic facets of the *Canzoniere* story by drawing attention to relations between them as suggested by the concluding remark on the above poems: reason succumbed to desire ("Dicit etiam rationem appetitui succubuisse"). This remark refers to the poet's confession in sonnet *RVF* 240:

> I' no'l posso negar, Donna, et no'l nego,
> che la ragion, ch'ogni bona alma affrena,
> non sia dal voler vinta. (*RVF* 240.5–7)

135 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

For the first time in this censorship, reason is mentioned. It is no accident that Barrio pointed to the connection between reason and appetite, and chose the word "appetite" ("appetitus") rather than "will" ("voler"), the word used by the poet. According to Thomas Aquinas, "appetite" can refer to all sorts of inclinations but in the case of lascivious love, "appetite" can be understood to be "disordered" ("inordinatus") and mean "carnal concupiscience."[136] This concept accounts for Barrio's interpretation. Barrio's comments again contain evidence that he reflected upon what he found in the work and, to a certain degree, tried to understand it from his perspective as a censor.

As demonstrated above, Barrio's examination of the pagan god Amor revealed evidence that Petrarch accepted responsibility for his sins. Barrio's interest in this is evident in his comment on the subsequent list, which includes the poems *RVF* 239, 76, 121, 6, 21, 153, 70, 237, 22. The two copies of the censorship contain different versions of this comment. In the first, it is important to note that Barrio established a connection between carnal love and the denial of free will, adding a few examples of superstitious ideas:

> In his novem cantilenis sicut in aliis omnibus suum in lauram amorem libidinosum esse ostendit, liberam hominis negat voluntatem. lauram suo amori reluctatam fuisse dicit. et ideo de cupidine queritur. se infelicem vocat, quod suo amori reluctaretur, et illius concubitum cupit, suum desiderium vanum esse dicit, maledicit diei, quo natus est. et fato se obstrictum fuisse dicit, ut lauram adamaret. nec ab eius amore quiescere posse.
> [*RVF* 239, 76, 121, 6, 21, 153, 70, 237, 22]

In the second copy, Barrio suppressed the illustrative details. The denial of free will, Laura's rejection of Petrarch's love, the poet's complaints, his wish for sexual union, and the curse of his birth do not appear. The comment reads: "In his octo cantilenis, sicut et in aliis omnibus, suum in lauram amorem libidinosum esse ostendit, et se fato obstrictum fuisse dicit illam adamaret, et nec ab illius amore quiescere posse ait." (*RVF* 76, 121, 6, 21, 253, 70, 237, 22).[137]

By making this change, Barrio narrowed the comment down to focus on the problem he believed to be at the heart of the matter: that of Petrarch demonstrating his love to be impure and his declaration that fate destined him to experience impure love. Barrio thereby emphasized the relation between

136 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, ed. Joseph Pecci (3rd edn., Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1926), II, ii, quaest. 77 art. 5.

137 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b, e.

impure love and superstitious ideas of fate, important because it is vital in the *Avertimento* on love poetry. The reason becomes clear in connection with Barrio's interpretation of the pagan god Amor/Cupido as an allegory of Petrarch's carnal love in sonnets *RVF* 69 and 89. Both superstition and impure love are indications of the lover's distance from the Catholic God.

4.4 Censorship and Guided Reading

To guide the reader through a text with the help of comments in the margins or elsewhere was an official form of censorship. The Clementine *Index* includes a special clause about this form of control (*Instructio de correctione librorum* § iv), as shown above. If texts suspected of nonconformance to Catholicism were not corrected, their reading was expected to be guided and ideally controlled, and its digestion influenced. At that time, editors and publishers made use of commentaries in poetic works as seen in the *Furioso*, *Canzoniere* and *Divina Commedia*, all of which contained delicate materials regarding the faith. Censorship and poetry used similar methods of contributing to the reading process, and it is time to take a closer look.

One might expect the *Furioso* to have been expurgated following Galletti's extensive censorship, but that was not the case. The correction provided by the Inquisition of Ferrara differs greatly from Galletti's and appears moderate in comparison, concentrating on religious language and names of biblical and Christian historical characters resulting in the superstitious elements that Galletti wished to correct being almost completely accepted. This raises the question of the reasons for the differences. What is more, this correction was never effected. No print edition showing the corrections suggested by the document from Ferrara has been identified, although the correspondence between the Congregation for the Index and the Inquisition of Ferrara contains evidence that the Congregation was satisfied with the result.

There is certainly more than one reason for the moderate correction and the missing print edition. Fragnito has shown that the Congregation for the Index was more lenient towards sacred poetry at the beginning of the seventeenth century.[138] Even if her observation refers to religious poetry, one should bear in mind that this could also have been true for profane texts containing material from Sacred Scripture or liturgical texts. Her thesis can be confirmed insofar as the files of the Congregation for the Index reveal that at the end of the sixteenth century the Congregation had been willing to grant poetry more

138 Cf. Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, 118–9.

freedom even in the field of religious poetry regarding, for example, paraphrasing sections of Sacred Scripture.[139] This development may not have been the only reason, however.

As we learn from Vincenzo Bonardo's *Discorso intorno all'Indice da farsi de libri prohibiti*, the secretary reminded the Congregation for the Index that many books containing love and battles, songs and poems, stories, orations, comic stories, spiritual books and plays based on the Sacred Scripture were read everywhere. He points to massive economic consequences for printers, booksellers and writers if such books were to be suppressed. It is clear from the files of the Congregation that the Inquisition of Ferrara was instructed to treat works such as the *Satire* of Ariosto and Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare sopra il Boccaccio* carefully in order not to distort the sense and intention of the author. These works, however, are of less literary value than the *Furioso*, so one might assume that a similar instruction could have influenced the expurgation of the *Furioso*.

What are mentioned by neither Bonardo nor the files of the Congregation for the Index are the rich exegetical commentaries that accompanied several sixteenth-century editions of the *Furioso*. As early as fifty years prior to Galletti's submission of his censorship to the Roman censorial authorities, commentaries paid particular attention to the allegorical interpretation of the main characters. Among these characters were some that had been examined by Galletti, Astolfo, Orlando, Ruggiero, Alcina and Atlante. Magic was also presented as a poetic means by which characters could experience wishes and desires, if only fleetingly. Transformations of characters were explained as consequences of libido, which defeats human reason, reducing characters to creatures more akin to animals, plants or stones. Transformations were thus to be understood in a figurative sense.[140]

It is worth mentioning that the Clementine *Index* stresses that all sorts of texts accompanying a work were to be included in the censorial assessment.[141] It does not mean that prior to this *Index* commentaries or other paratexts were not examined; the *Index* of 1564 provides special clauses for the treatment of commentaries added by heretics, so the Roman Church was aware that commentaries could be of importance. The *Enchiridion Ecclesiasticum* by Gregory of Naples, a member of a group of censors entrusted with the

139 Ibid., 118–20.

140 Cf. the edition prepared by Ruscelli (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1556); also Clemente Valgrisi, *Prefazione su l'Orlando furioso a chi legge*, in Ariosto, *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Valgrisi, 1566); on this e.g. Sberlati, *Il genere e la disputa*, 70, 253s.

141 *Index* of 1596, *Instructio de correctione*, § ii.

revision of books by the archbishop of Naples, published an extensive list which includes Aesop with Erasm, Gilbert Cousin, Nikolaus Gerbel, Laurentius Absternius, Aristophanes with Andreas Cratander and Simon Grynaeus, Claudius Cantiuncula with Christoph Hegendorph, a grammar book by Aldo Manuzio with Erasm, Virgil's *Bucolics* with Erasm, Euricius Cordus, Georg Sabinus, Joachim Camerarius, Sébastien Châtellion, Cicero with more than a dozen commentators, among whom we find Antonio Brucioli and Jacobus Micyllus, Dionysius Cato again with Erasm, Catullus with Hadrianus Junius, Tacitus with Helius Eobanus Hessus, Micyllus, Vincentius Opsopoeus, Greek Epigrammata with Micyllus, Johann Heyl (Soter), Johannes Sleidanus, Philipp Melanchthon, lyric poets with Hessus, Conrad Gessner and Melanchthon, to give only a few examples. Other authors were Horace, Hesiod, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Boccacio, Martial, Ovid, Plautus, Persius, Plutarch, Prudentius, Pindar, Quintilian, Suetonius, Sallust, Seneca, Sophocles, Theocritus, Terence, Livy, Virgil and Xenophon.[142] This form of censorship can also be found in earlier documents on poetry, such as the *Avertimento* on the *Rime* of Bembo, Sannazaro and Ariosto. The anonymous author of the *Avertimento* examined the *Vita* of Sannazaro as well as annotations made by the editor Francesco Sansovino and others.[143]

Significantly, the *Correttione* prepared at the Inquisition of Ferrara indicates which edition was used for the examination: Venice, Gabriel Giolito, 1552. This edition contains brief summaries with allegorical and moralizing interpretations preceding each canto. Since the question of why the expurgation project of the *Furioso* was apparently not terminated remains unanswered, one could consider whether the brief comments found in the 1552 edition, together with the rich sixteenth-century commentaries, protected the *Furioso*. This is not the place for a detailed analysis of the sixteenth-century commentaries on the *Furioso*, but some examples of allegorical interpretations to illustrate this idea are outlined below, taken from editions produced by Giolito in 1550 and 1552, Domenico et Giovan Battista Guerra in 1570, Vincenzo Valgrisi in 1558 and 1565 and Francesco De Franceschi in 1584. They may serve to highlight a few analogies between the commentaries and censorships.

Canto 3: One danger observed by Galletti in canto 3 was the description of Merlin's ghost and his prophetic gift, neither of which conformed to the Catholic faith. The comment provided in Giolito 1550 and 1552 (ed. 1552 used by the Inquisition of Ferrara) as well as in Valgrisi 1558, refers to a scene where the ghost and the witch Melissa are introduced. Instead of explaining these

142 Gregory of Naples, the list *Libri corrigendi* begins at 146r.

143 See Appendix, doc. 1.2f.

characters and their performances, the Giolito edition points out that this canto imitates Virgil's *Aeneid*.[144] At first glance this does not appear to be an excuse, but rather a well-thought-out comment. By presenting this scene as an imitation of a classical pagan work, it indirectly suggests that it was possible for non-Christian elements to stem from pagan models and thus be understood and accepted as such. It also emphasizes the poem's literary value. Since there is no proper explanation to excuse the magician's ghost, this is a risky but plausible solution:

> In questo terzo canto a imitatione di Virgilio in persona di Melissa, laquale dimostra a Bradamante i suoi discendenti, si discrivono le laude della Illustrissima Casa di Este.[145]

In the edition published by Guerra in 1570 in which the comments are entitled *Allegorie*, Tommaso Porcacchi presents the witch Melissa as a spiritual example because she appears lasciviously disheveled and barefoot with unbound hair. He explains that for the purpose of divine sacrifice the soul must be free from the influence of the flesh. Porcacchi tries to justify the character by making her an example to Catholic readers and giving her a role that is not only acceptable but also useful from the Catholic standpoint. The entire episode is interpreted as an allegory of the difficult path to virtue, lessening the danger of Melissa's occult ritual in the church and the conjuration of demons:

> Per Melissa, che nel mostrare a Bradamante gli occolti secreti delle cose a venire, era discinta, scalza, e scapigliata; si denota che chi attende a sacrifici divini, deve haver l'animo sciolto & libero da ogni legame corporale. Per la strada che fra monti inaccessibili amendue fecero, salendo balze, & traversando torrenti, per uscir dalla grotta di Merlino, & andare al lucente castel d'acciaio; si comprende con quanta difficoltà, & fatica l'huomo camini all'acquisto della virtù.[146]

The comment in the editions of Vincenzo Valgrisi (Venice, 1558) and Francesco De Franceschi (Venice, 1584) appears more neutral. It plays with moral

144 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Giolito, 1550), 11r, (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558), 23, (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1565), 23.

145 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Giolito, 1550), 10v, (Venice: Giolito, 1552), 11v.

146 *Orlando furioso, con gli argomenti in ottava rima di M. Lodovico Dolce et con le allegorie et l'annotationi a ciascun canto di Thomaso Porcacchi* (Venice: Domenico et Gio. Battista Guerra, fratelli, 1570), canto 3.

categories that accentuate the opposition of good and bad and claims Melissa's prediction to have been willed by the heavens, indicating that she is on the side of the good. She and her occult ritual are thus opposed to the bad:

> In questo terzo canto, ove il poeta fa predire et mostrar molt'anni prima che nascessero, i discendenti dell'Illustrissima casa da Este, si viene a conoscere, che le persone chiare, vogliono i Cieli che vivano, et sien note al mondo avanti che vi scendano, mentre vi sono, et dopo morte. Là dove all'incontro i vili, et oscuri, appena si può dir che vivano quel poco spatio di tempo, che qui stanno, solamente a far'ombra et numero.[147]

Canto 4: The comments in Giolito 1550 and 1552 first point to Bradamante, who breaks Atlante's spells with a magic ring. They explain that the poet is demonstrating how virtue and reason defeat fraud. The comment explains and defends Rinaldo's criticism of the Scottish law. This criticism, in turn, is censored by Galletti because he believes the criticism creates a misleading image of Christian knights who should serve exemplary functions in Christian poems:

> In questo quarto per Bradamante, che col valor de l'anello fa ritornar vani gli incanti di Atlante, & lo vince, si dimostra la virtù congiunta con la ragione superare ogni fraude. Et in persona di Rinaldo, che biasima, la legge laquale Ginevra condannava a morte, si riprendon gli huomini, che ne gli adulterii puniscono le femine, & essi ne vanno impuniti.[148]

The editions published by Valgrisi and De Franceschi seek to explain the power of Angelica's magic ring and enchantments through Catholicism:

> La virtù che o per mezo di parole sacre, o per qual si voglia altra via, il primo facitor dell'anello d'Angelica impetrò da i Cieli, di far vano ogni incanto, ci dimostra come le potenze superiori, o celesti habbiano imperio sopra l'infernali, & aeree, che sole son quelle che adoprano negl'incanti:

147 *Orlando furioso, Annotationi, avvertimenti, et dichiarazioni di Ieronimo Ruscelli* (Venice: Francesco De Franceschi Senese e compagni, 1584), 23. Orlando furioso (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558) 23. The De Franceschi edition also contains an elaborate allegorical interpretation of the entire work: *Allegoria di Gioseffo Bononome sopra il Furioso di m. Lodovico Ariosto al molto Magnifico et Illustrissimo Cavalier il Signor Bonifacio Agliardo, gentil'huomo honoratissimo di Bergamo*.

148 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Giolito, 1550), 14r, (Venice: Giolito, 1552), 15v.

> & quanto benignamente esse virtù celesti aiutino chi vuol valersene, a far che la ragion vinca i sensi, & il vero, l'apparente, e'l falso.[149]

The Guerra edition of 1570 suggests that the wizard Atlante ought to be understood as an allegory of lascivious love so he can be defeated by Bradamante, who represents modesty:

> Atlante, che si diletta di veder tirar colpi a' Cavalieri, che divengono suoi prigioni; rappresenta Amore, che induce a scherzare & a giuocare i suoi soggetti. Bradamante, che per virtù dell'anello lo vince, & libera tanti prigioni; significa la pudicitia, che vince ogni amor lascivo, & leva di servitù coloro, che francamente dispongono di seguir più tosto la ragione, che l'appetito.[150]

Canto 6: Editions Giolito 1550 and 1552 concentrate on a moralizing allegorical reading of Astolfo's transformation and Ruggiero's arrival in the realm of Alcina. The enchanted knight represents man being overcome by passion and, in Ruggiero's experience, the reader is meant to recognize what lasciviousness can do to man:

> In questo sesto canto per Astolfo trasformato in pianta, comprendesi l'huomo, dato in preda de lo appetito perdere i sentimenti humani; & per Ruggiero, che da lui ammonito doppo lo assalto de i Mostri affigurati per il vitio, pure si lascia da le due donne condurre al Regno di Alcina: si conosce quanto sopra noi habbia le più volte maggior forza la lascivia, & quello che aggrada a l'occhio che la ragione, e il sano et diritto conoscimento.[151]

Similarly, editions of Valgrisi and De Franceschi focus on a moral allegoresis of superstitious elements:

> Il palagio d'Alcina in questo sesto canto, et ella che doppo l'haversi alcuni giorni goduto gli amanti, gli trasformava in piante, & in fere, ci ricordano

149 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558), 32, cf. *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Francesco De Franceschi, 1584), 32.

150 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Guerra, 1570), see canto 4.

151 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Giolito, 1550), 21v, (Venice: Giolito, 1552), 24v.

> quanto le lascivie habbian forza di privar d'ogni forma di persona umana, non che della ragione, & dell'intelletto, chi si dà loro in preda.[152]

as does the *Allegoria* of the Guerra-edition:

> Ruggiero che nel voler passare a Logistilla s'incontra in una strana torma di fiere mostruose, è l'huomo che nel voler dare opera alla virtù; viene impedito da strana torma di pensieri, & desideri volgari. Le due donne che sopra candidi Leocorni sedendo, lo guidano ad Alcina; rappresentano le lascivie d'amore, che da principio vengono in sembianza di semplice & candida honestà, & poi lo danno alla scoperta in preda al vitio.[153]

The interpretation of canto 8 in Giolito 1550/1552 continues on the moralizing and allegorical line: Ruggiero's departure from Alcina's realm and arrival in the realm of her sister Logistilla symbolizes man's ability to overcome desire and subsequent moral refinement. An appropriate interpretation of Alcina is assured. Through Orlando, who left his army to look for Angelica, it is demonstrated that love can dominate man, causing him to neglect honest and useful things:

> Questo ottavo per Ruggiero; che vinti i ministri di Alcina, se ne va a Logistilla, si comprende l'huomo superati gli assalti de l'appetito ritrarsi a la vita virtuosa. In Orlando il quale per cercare Angelica abbandona la difesa di Parigi, altro non si contiene che la forza d'Amore; il quale quando aviene, che troppo signoreggi l'huomo, fa che egli per conseguire i suoi desideri ponea dietro le cose honeste, & utili a le biasimevoli, & dannose.[154]

A similar line of interpretation can be found in De Franceschi 1584, but its argumentation is sharper here:

> Logistilla alla quale Ruggier fuggendo si salva, rappresenta la ragione, alla quale ricorrendo ci salviamo. Alcina, che non può morir fin che dura il mondo, mostra che sono immortali, & non da potersi mai spegnere

152 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Francesco De Franceschi, 1584), 51, cf. *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558), 51, (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1565), 51, *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Francesco De Franceschi, 1584), 51.

153 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Guerra, 1570), see canto 6.

154 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Giolito, 1550), 29r, (Venice: Giolito, 1552), 33r.

> affatto, i desiderii & piaceri amorosi, fin che dura l'huomo, che è chiamato Microcosmo, cioè picciol mondo. Il che par che nello stesso Canto poi mostri Orlando, il quale in età già grave, & di già molti anni preso dell'Amor d'Angelica, è sforzato d'abbandonar finalmente il Re suo, la sua patria, & quasi la fede, & religion sua, per andarle appresso.[155]

In Guerra 1570, Porcacchi focuses differently, but it resembles the other editions:

> Per Astolfo, & per Ruggiero, che dall'Isola d'Alcina si riducono a Logistilla, viene allegoricamente compresa la natura del l'huomo temperato, & del continente. Percioché quegli senza alcuno stimolo v'arriva un'hora prima, per l'amor c'ha alla virtù; & questi vi giunge con più fatica & sudore, rispetto al servo, ch'è il timore; all'uccello, ch'è lo sfrenato appetito; al cane ch'è il dolore; et al cavallo, ch'è l'allegrezza soverchia che lo perturbano.[156]

In Valgrisi and De Franceschi, an explanation is provided regarding the episode in canto 10 where the fay Logistilla gives a winged horse to Ruggiero so that he may view the world from above. From this one may understand that man is able to surpass others via reason in order to experience joy and glory. The non-existent, 'fantastic' winged horse is indirectly explained and defended:

> . . . Per Logistilla, che rimette Ruggiero su'l cavallo alato da poter in aria veder tutto il mondo, si comprende che gli huomini i quali vivono con le leggi della ragione, soprastanno a gli altri huomini, & se ne volano felici, & gloriosi per tutto il mondo.[157]

Looking more closely, one may recognize that these interpretations indirectly support Galletti's censorship. The number of elements of the poem criticized by Galletti and explained in the *Allegorie* is striking. They offer a moralizing interpretation of passages which were delicate in the eyes of a censor, and endeavor to align potentially perilous and suspicious elements of the story with the Catholic faith. This becomes more apparent in Porcacchi's interpretation of the character of Alcina in the *Cinque canti*. Porcacchi applies an idea derived from Catholic demonology:

---

155 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558), 70, (Venice: Francesco De Franceschi, 1584), 70.

156 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Guerra, 1570), see canto 8.

157 *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558), 91 and (Venice: Francesco De Franceschi, 1584), 91.

> Gano portato per l'aria in una nave fantastica ad Alcina per dare ordine all'impresa di destrugger Carlo con tutti i paladini; ci rappresenta la malvagia & pessima natura del fraudolente, et invidioso: il quale per dare effetto a' suoi perversi desideri; si va imaginando castelli in aria, & fra se stesso pensa, & discorre mille impossibilità. E in ultimo, non potendo fare altro, con mille sacramenti s'obliga ad Alcina, cioè si dà in preda fino al Diavolo, per tirare a fine i pessimi pensieri suoi.[158]

The interpretations go so far as to give the impression that their authors had a deep understanding and awareness of delicate elements as well as censorship legislation, and that they had been efficient in dealing with this. This is no coincidence. Up until now no direct relation between these commentaries and Roman censorship has been proven, but the files of the Riformatori dello Studio di Padova, who not only supervised the government of the University of Padova and its teachings, but were also entrusted with censorship and printing privileges, reveal that several Venetian editors, writers and poets were actively involved in lay censorship in the second half of the sixteenth century. Among them were Paolo Manuzio, Domenico Venier, Paolo Sigonio, Lodovico Dolce and Girolamo Ruscelli, all of whom worked for the local censorship authorities and assessed which books were to be printed.

Lodovico Dolce may be of interest here because he prepared several vernacular poetic texts for publication. He provided a revised edition of the *Furioso* in 1535 with an *Apologia contra ai detrattori dell'Autore* (Venice: Pasini, 1535). Beginning in the early 1540s he worked for the famous printer Giovanni Gabriele Giolito, one of the most successful publishers of Venice, and was involved in Giolito's above-mentioned *Furioso* editions.[159] Judging from the documents I have reviewed, Dolce first appears as a lay censor in the files of the Riformatori dello Studio di Padova in 1554, perhaps even earlier.[160] Dolce must have been familiar with criteria of censorship through his editorial work at Giolito's before he began his work as a lay censor. As a printer, Giolito was required to be informed about what was prohibited and why, and the same was true for his employees. Like all printers, he needed to know what he was permitted to sell because, particularly at that time, printers, not authors, were

158 See the edition (Venice: Domenico et Giovan Battista Guerra, fratelli, 1570), e.g. the allegory of the first of the *Cinque canti*.

159 Cf. Anne Neuschäfer, *Lodovico Dolce als dramatischer Autor im Venedig des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2004).

160 See Venice, Archivio di Stato di Venezia (=ASV), Riformatori dello Studio di Padova, Licenze, b. 284, e.g. fasc. 1, c. 9, fasc. 2.

responsible for obtaining the printing privileges for books.[161] Consequently, books had to be readied to pass an assessment. One way in which this was achieved was through proper interpretation of delicate passages.

The Ferrara expurgation of the *Furioso* makes no mention of the interpretations of the allegories, which indicates that, if the legislation of the *Index* was fully considered in the assessment, the allegories must have been accepted by the censors and the Congregation for the Index. If such had not been the case, documents would have referred to them, as the *Avertimento* of the Petrarchist *Rime* refers to paratexts, as discussed above. The *Furioso* files, in fact, include assessments of other texts printed in the examined editions, for instance, the *Stanze di m. Lodovico Ariosto nelle quali seguitando al canto trentesimosecondo la materia del Furioso, si descrive la roina di Roma et d'Italia dal tempo di Costantino per insino a la nostra età, Stanze del signor Aluigi Gonzaga detto Rodomonte a m. Lodovico Ariosto* and *Stanze del medesimo in lode della sua donna*.[162] For this reason, putting aside motives such as economics, respect for poetic artistry and cultural 'heritage,' the allegorical interpretations could well account for the moderate treatment of the work; in fact, they could explain even more because up until now there is no trace of a printed version of the *Furioso* that acknowledges the *Correttione*.

As mentioned above, discussions and decrees emerge from the *Diarii* of the Congregation for the Index, a text documenting the Congregation's proceedings, that suggest that in 1609 Ludovico Ystella, master of the sacred palace, asked the Congregation whether the *Furioso* should be printed in Rome. He did not specify whether he was referring to the purged or original version, but for exactly this reason it is most likely that he meant the original. This can be confirmed by the fact that there is no purged printed version according to the *Correttione*. There must, however, be an explanation as to why the Congregation suddenly rejected an expurgated print edition after they had approved and prepared a corrected version. Exegetical apparatus may offer a plausible reason.

161 For a collection of Giolito's printing privileges see Angela Nuovo and Christian Coppens, *I Giolito e la stampa nell'Italia del XVI secolo* (Genève: Droz, 2005) that reproduces no privilege for the first *Furioso* editions.

162 Ariosto, *Orlando furioso con i cinque canti* (Venezia: Giolito, 1552), 222r–5v, 252r–v and 252v–3r.

4.5 Shaping Narrative Structures—On the Fantastic

The censorship of fictional supernatural phenomena reveals a pattern recalling modern theories on the fantastic in literature. According to them, the fantastic is a complex narrative structure connected to epistemological changes that took place in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is therefore worthwhile to examine how earlier censors dealt with the structure of marvelous and fantastic elements.

Censors sought to distinguish reality from fiction. They approached texts from the Catholic perspective, so their concept of reality was Catholic. They defined "truth" on the basis of this concept and rejected "untruth," or "fiction," because it had the potential to present readers with a version of reality that departed from the Catholic one. This approach seems plausible, especially in light of *Apostolici regiminis*, which only acknowledges the Catholic truth. The number of supernatural elements is vast and includes the devil, demons, angels, nymphs, deities and semi-deities, fairies and ghosts, to name a few. The above censorships of poetry and poetics show how supernatural elements of different belief systems were mingled prior to the tightening of censorship legislation but were subsequently sorted out by censors. Not all supernatural and marvelous elements were suppressed, only those that did not agree with the Catholic faith. God, angels, demons, and the devil could remain if depicted appropriately. Even witches and sorcerers were acceptable as characters as long as they fit Catholic beliefs. Any entity that did not fit the Catholic view of these characters and their related phenomena was held to contradict the faith and was therefore not permitted; alternatively, the entity could be described as untrue and explained or interpreted allegorically. Anything inexplicable was not to be depicted if it suggested a threat to the Catholic faith. This form of imitation implied the existence of beings and phenomena considered real in the Catholic faith that were to be respected. The same applied to their depictions; they were not to be distorted, decried or abused.

Poetic imitation was expected to be Catholic, an *imitatio Catholica*. Censorship sought to fight the secularization of the Catholic faith and theology as well as stances that questioned the Catholic truth and reduced it to fiction, which is why poetics and poetry were considered dangerous, as illustrated above. The *Furioso* played with the Catholic concept of reality as well as with ideas considered superstitious, and added new inventions. Boundaries between truth and fiction were constantly blurred. Ariosto depicted a world full of elements he had either invented or borrowed from poetic tradition or Catholic faith and history, one reason why Ronsard called his poetry "fantastic." As a result, nothing is certain; the poem mirrors a world in which there is

no reliable truth. From the censorial perspective, Catholic truth was indirectly questioned. The effect of Ariosto's poetry was the opposite of what Catholic imitation desired, implying that it did not strengthen the reader's faith, part of the vision of Catholic reform.

To clarify this censorial approach, one could say that censors sought and, where necessary, restored a narrative level of Catholic reality, separating it from another level that included all invented elements that contravened the faith. They worked with a narrative structure, probably not discussing narrative levels or structures of the stories in a poetological context, but they worked with them, perhaps unconsciously. In a sense they tidied up the poetic world; they shaped the narrative structure according to their concept of reality.

A pattern becomes evident that recalls the classic model of fantastic literature. It includes the concept of two levels appearing in one story whereby one level depicts reality as understood by the society of the time while the other includes a supernatural phenomenon which breaks the laws of nature and cannot be explained. The texts play with the possibility that the supernatural phenomenon is true in the poetic world. While some critics believe that any text with such a structure belongs to the genre of fantastic literature, others consider fantastic literature to have been a phenomenon which arose during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

This study does not intend to speak for one or the other position but only seeks to point out aspects of censorship in the light of the two. According to the second position, the Enlightenment and French Revolution brought about an epistemological break. Reason and laws of nature, not Catholicism, shaped the new concept of reality, allowing elements of the supernatural from past systems of belief to reappear in literature as uncanny and fantastic phenomena. Such elements were used as aesthetic "Spielmaterial" and set the scene for sublimated narration. Fantastic literature left the old realistic-mimetic model behind and began to explore new freedom.[163]

It is noteworthy that censors worked with a pattern or structure similar to the modern fantastic when they demanded the separation of the two levels: the realistic and the supernatural that could not be explained within their system of belief. The dominating concepts of reality in the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries were, of course, different.[164] The fact remains, however, that censors demanded the suppression of the inexplicable supernatural and what

163 See Scharold, 24–8.

164 Cf. Marianne Wünsch, *Die Fantastische Literatur der Frühen Moderne* (*1890–1930*). *Definition, denkgeschichtlicher Kontext, Strukturen* (Munich: Fink, 1991), 1.3.

could probably have become either the fantastic of their time or a structure similar to that of the modern fantastic.

Further, a supernatural event was deemed acceptable if it could be explained in a way that did not support a concept of reality that differed from the Catholic one. If references to the supernatural were not deleted, it was important to explain them. It was apparently unacceptable to leave a reader in uncertainty so as not to put him at risk of making errors about the faith. According to Tzvetan Todorov, however, uncertainty is a crucial criterion of fantastic literature. In order for a text to be considered fantastic, the character(s) as well as the reader must be left in uncertainty as to whether the supernatural is real; if the supernatural can be explained within the concept of reality or if "the laws of reality" remain intact and allow an explanation of the events, the text is no longer fantastic.[165] Fantastic literature of this kind could not have prevailed under this form of censorship.

Todorov has identified three categories of fantastic material: uncanny fantastic, fantastic marvelous and pure fantastic. It is possible to explain uncanny fantastic supernatural events at the end of a text using rational causes such as dreams, drugs, betrayals, illusions, tricks of the senses and madness; either the fantastic event had not taken place at all, or it had a rational explanation. Fantastic marvelous events represent themselves as fantastic and therefore have to be acknowledged as supernatural. Such texts suggest the existence of the supernatural caused by the devil's intent, for instance, or simply by accidents. Thus, the fantastic marvelous closely resembles the pure fantastic, but at the end the marvelous prevails. According to Todorov, the difference between the fantastic and the marvelous is that the marvelous does not provoke a particular reaction in the reader.[166]

This leads to the question of what role censorship played in the development of the marvelous and fantastic in literature. This is not the place to answer this question. According to Scharold, the *Index* prohibited the depictions of wonders in general. On the basis of the above censorship materials it is hard to confirm this thesis. The marvelous had a place in poetry after the tightening of censorship at the beginning of the sixteenth century, one of the reasons that Ariosto felt compelled to polish his marvelous. The marvelous was restricted in order to respect and conform to the Catholic faith. From the censorial perspective this clearly implied the transformation of the marvelous and

165 See Tzvetan Todorov, *Einführung in die fantastische Literatur* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1972) 40.

166 Ibid. 43–51.

whatever had the potential to become the fantastic. The impact of censorship on poetry and poetic theory thus needs to be looked at more closely.

Certainly poetological debates on the marvelous were of importance and influenced poetic creation considerably.[167] In view of the censorship of the marvelous and developing fantastic elements, censorship's driving force in poetry's development can hardly be denied. To focus instead on poetological debates could be misleading and exonerate other forces of society such as those that enforced the law and made its violation a crime. It is important to question why intellectual emancipation from the Catholic faith alone should have led to such a drastic transformation of literature and the restriction of poetic imagination and creativity. One must ask why poetics and poetry worked on the transformation of the marvelous.

167 Cf. Scharold, 47, 50–1.

CHAPTER 5

Censures of Love

Love was one of the most popular themes of medieval and Renaissance poetry. Linked to morality, philosophy and theology, it is discussed in various censorship files of the Congregation for the *Index*. The *Index* offers enough material to understand how and why the poetic depiction and interpretation of love played a role in censorship. In regard to its laws, aside from *Rules* VIII and IX, *Rule* VII of the *Index* of 1564 is believed to have had an immense impact on literature. In order to protect the faith ("fides") and good morals ("boni mores"), this law prohibited all books in which lascivious or obscene things ("res lascivas seu obscoenas") were treated, narrated or taught on purpose ("ex professo").[1] Since, like *Rule* IX, this prohibition was very broad, such books were generally prohibited but their titles did not have to be listed *nominatim* in the *Index*. Only Latin and Greek works by classical authors were to be treated with special indulgence and permitted because of their elegance and style. This seems tolerant, but there were implicit restrictions.

A draft of *Rule* VII, indirectly recalling the constitutions of the Council of Florence of 1517/18 (section *De magistris deque hereticis Christianae fidei scandalizantibus*)[2] makes clear that exceptions were not to be made for works such as the dialogues by Lucian of Samosata, Ovid's *Ars amatoria* and Martial's epigrams.[3] The reception of classical texts was further restricted inasmuch as young people were not allowed to read classical poetry containing lascivious or obscene elements or listen to it being read aloud.[4] The general privileged treatment did not apply to translations of the classics; in fact, the Latin language could, to a certain degree, protect Catholic texts from censorship because the number of readers familiar with Latin was much smaller than that of readers of vernacular books. But this was not the rule. Robert Bellarmine suggested that certain Latin Renaissance poetic works should be put on the *Index*

1 On 'fides et mores', see also *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*, ed. Otto Gradewitz and others (Berolini: Reimeri, 1939), and *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1957).

2 Cf. Chap. 1.1.

3 Cf. *Regulas generales*, in *Concilii Tridentini tractatuum*, 605.

4 Cf. *Regula* VII, *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_006

nominatim, such as Giovanni Pontano's *Lepidina*, *Hendecasyllaba*, *Tumuli* and *Epigrammata*.[5]

As demonstrated above, the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum* of 1596 (§§ iii and iv) shows tolerance towards 'ancient' Catholic authors. It ordains that works written before 1515 were not to be corrected, regardless of the language in which they were written. In order to explain and correct sections in which the ancient Catholic authors had erred or sinned, comments (*scholia, adnotationes*) were to be inserted, but the original texts were not to be altered.

But what is meant by the vague expression "lascivious or obscene things" ("res lascivae seu obscoenae")? Unlike other laws, *Rule* VII does not only refer to "words" ("verba"), it also speaks of "things" ("res"). "Things" may be defined as anything that exists.[6] In addition to texts, "things" could refer to illuminations, images, engravings, (that is, *libri muti*), and even music scores. Manuel Bertolini notes that the Roman *Indexes* of 1559 and 1564 do not contain music scores, probably because he has not found prohibitions expressed *nominatim*.[7] The wording of *Rule* VII does not, however, appear to actually exclude music scores. Not only was the writing and reading about love of a certain nature considered dangerous, singing such love songs was also a danger as the souls of poets, singers or listeners were engaged in uncouth thoughts, which, it was believed, had the potential to excite libido.[8]

It is therefore plausible that Constabile emphasized that the May 1574 prohibition applied to songs of an immoral nature.[9] This prohibition automatically concerned music books such as the madrigal scores that had been widely used since the 1540s; thus, collections of music scores are listed in the category of *Libri volgari sospetti* by Di Dio in his unofficial manuscript *Index*.[10] Furthermore, the *Index* of Parma of 1580 includes a section *Libri di Musica* with

5 See Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 158 and ibid. *Bellarminiana*, doc. 12c; Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. K, 79r–80r.

6 See the entry 'res', in *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*.

7 See Manuel Bertolini, "Poesia, musica, censura. Testi italiani del XVI e del XVII secolo," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, 46 (2010), 273–301, 274. On "libri muti" Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVII, 1 (n. p.); this source stems from the pontificate of Sixtus V, but the idea is far older.

8 Cf. the letter from Sirleto to Cervino of 7 February 1546, *Concilium Tridentini Epistularum*, p. 1, Complectens epistulas a die 5 martii 1545 ad Concilii translationem 11 martii 1547 scriptas, collegit, editi, illustravit Godofredus Buschbell, in: *Concilium Tridentinum* (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1916), t. 10, 934 at n. 5, and 574.

9 Cf. Constabile, *Aviso*, in *ILI*, ix.

10 See Vatican, ACDF, Index XIV.

La Marmoretta, La Mascherata, Girolamo Parabosco and Petrarch's *Fiamma del cielo, L'avara Babilonia* and *Fontana del dolore*.[11] Likewise, the Sistine *Index* of 1590 ordains the censorship of music scores (*Rule* XIV).[12]

As no explicit general prohibition of music books has been traced in sixteenth-century *Indexes* printed subsequent to the Sistine *Index*, Cerrón Puga has concluded that the Roman *Index* no longer expressed the general prohibition of non-conforming music scores.[13] There is a document dating to the pontificate of Sixtus V in which the Congregation for the Index explains that the control of the music of minstrels did not fall within their jurisdiction; in fact, they apparently considered such censorship to be unfeasible.[14] This statement referred only to the songs of minstrels, however, not to music scores, as Godman has correctly observed. This is the only known statement dating back to the late 1580s; the Sistine *Rule* XIV that includes music books dates to the year 1590.

One might question whether music scores were no longer included in the *Indexes* subsequent to that of Sixtus V. One could argue that *Rule* VII of the Tridentine *Index* contains no prohibition expressed *nominatim* and refers only to undefined contents ("res") of books. One could go even further because, under Clement VIII, the *Index* of Trent was again promulgated with an additional list, so *Rule* VII remained in force. Since the music scores listed by Constabile and Di Dio contravened *Rule* VII and were prohibited, this prohibition cannot be considered entirely new. The explicit expression and publication of this prohibition was new, but it only expressed, albeit more clearly, what had been decreed ten years earlier at Trent. So, one might ask whether the function of Constabile's prohibition was to insistently remind the public of *Rule* VII. One must not forget that, at least in theory, the Roman *Index* was promulgated in order to control all forms of printed and handwritten books without bias to their contents.

The description of the contents as "lascivious" and "obscene" poses another question. The adjectives were often only understood in an erotic context,[15] but their meaning reached far beyond that. The Tridentine draft of *Rule* VII gives examples of texts concerned, such as works by Aretino and the *Celestina*, so it seems the law did not include love poetry such as that of Petrarch or sixteenth-century Petrarchists. Scholars have shown that in expurgated versions of

11 For prohibitions of music scores see the *Index* of Parma issued in 1580, *Novus index librorum prohibitorum et suspensorum*, in *ILI*, ix, 752s and 181.

12 Cf. Cerrón Puga, 226.

13 Ibid. 227.

14 Cf. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 103–4.

15 Cf. Wolf, *Index*.

Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, lascivious contents were preserved. Constabile's general prohibition of poetry of an immoral nature, however, includes works that seem less immoral in the erotic sense than Aretino and Ovid. Bembo's *Rime* and others were on local blacklists and the *Index* of Di Dio, and censorship files listed poetry by Petrarch, Boccaccio, Ariosto and others. How then is *Rule* VII and censorship politics regarding love poetry to be understood?

The word "obscene" ("obscoenus") does not only refer to the erotic sphere; it can also describe social and religious behavior towards a neighbor or the church and its institutions and representatives. Likewise, the meaning of "lascivious" ("lascivus") goes beyond eroticism to include moral negligence and carelessness.[16] That is why it was not only texts containing erotica, pornography or same-sex love that were deemed worthy of censorship on the grounds of this law, but works such as those by Aretino, Francesco Berni and, in the seventeenth century, poetry by Giambattista Marino.[17] Petrarch's love lyrics and Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, according to various sources, were already judged to be deeply immoral because they discuss a form of love deemed lascivious ("un amor lascivo") and ugly ("turpis"). One such source is Barrio's censorship of Petrarch's love lyrics. Barrio tried to prove that Petrarch imagined Laura's naked body and expressed his desire to touch her, kiss her, and have sex with her. For this reason, Petrarchan love is classified as sinful.[18] Further evidence is found in Laura's behavior towards the poet:

> Si amor ille honestus et religiosus erat, quid est cur Laura non modo amorem Petrarchae respuit, sed ei etiam colloquium, atque sui ipsius praesentiam denegat? Qua de re ipse in suis amatoris Cantilenis vehementer, et ut conicio, simulate quaeritur, et illam, quod eius amori reluctaretur, surdam, sibi adversam et inimicam appellat? Unde mulieris constantiam et suis ipsius iam per tot annos intemperantiam ostendit?[19]

Evidence is also found in the poet's own confession in the opening sonnet, as Barrio shows in *Pro lingua latina*. Here the poet's confession is used to explain

16 Cf. the entries for 'lascivo' and 'lascivia', in *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (Venice: Giovanni Alberti, 1612), also the entry 'lascivia', in *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*.

17 Cf. Clizia Carminati, *Giovanni Battista Marino tra inquisizione e censura* (Rome: Antenore, 2008).

18 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b, d, e. *Memoriale*, and Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.

19 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 415.

why the *Canzoniere* should not be read. If Petrarch himself felt ashamed of his work, why, asks Barrio, would people not be ashamed to read it?

> Et certe ipsemet praeter ea, quae dicta sunt, in ea cantilena, quae in principio eius libri posita est, se omnibus erroris materiam esse clare cognoscere, seque suarum cantilenarum pudere aperte fatetur. Et in quadam epistola, quae est ad Olimpium, praeter caetera, sic ait: Illa vulgaria iuvenilium laborum meorum cantica, quorum hodie me pudet ac poenitet, eodem morbo affectis sunt acceptissima. Quod si auctorem eas cantilenas scripsisse puduit, cur non pudet alios eas legere? Sed ipse dicit suas vanas et obscoenas cantilenas gratas fore eodem morbo affectis, quo ipse affectus fuit.[20]

Barrio locates passages in the Petrarchan love story where the poet, believing his love to be good and pure, refers to his love as a virtue, as in sonnet *RVF* 172: "O Invidia nimica di Vertute, / ch'a' bei principij volentier contrasti . . ." (*RVF* 172.1–2). This observation is important because it was not enough for censorship to recognize that the author had regretted his work in later years, it was also necessary to consider that the work remained accessible to readers. Barrio does not explicitly say that Petrarch's assumption was wrong, but he suggests that Petrarch mistook his sinful love for virtue.[21] Petrarch was suspected of having a false idea of 'right' love.

Another source is Bellarmine's *Responsio ad librum quendam anonymum cuius titulus est Aviso dato alla bella Italia*. Bellarmine criticizes Petrarch and Boccaccio for their descriptions of carnal love. He chooses the same expression as Barrio to describe it: "ugly love" ("amor turpis"). Although the *Responsio* was composed to refute a Protestant's work and defend the poets' orthodoxy, this judgment of their work is not very positive:

> Sed risum vix tenui cum Petrarcham, et Bocacium a morum sanctitate, vitaeque integritate laudari vidi, cum eorum scripta Italica, ob quae ab isto iuvene tantopere commendantur, nihil fere nisi turpes amores contineant, quorum etiam ipsum Petrarcham aliquando vehementer puduit . . .[22]

---

20 Ibid. 417.

21 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

22 Robert Bellarmine, *Responsio ad librum quondam anonymum cuius titulus est Avviso piacevole dato alla bella Italia*, in id., *Varii argumenti opuscula*, 542. On the *Responsio* and the poets cf. below Ch. 6.2.

Bellarmine's opinion was shared by an anonymous censor of Boccaccio's *Decamerone*. He points to Pampinea's canzone in the conclusion of the second *Giornata* and quotes the lines

> E quel che 'n questo m'è sommo piacere, è ch'io gli piaccio quanto egli a me piace, Amor, la tua merzede; per che in questo mondo il mio volere posseggo, e spero nell'altro aver pace per quella intera fede che io gli porto. Idio, che questo vede, del regno suo ancor ne sarà pio.

The censor explains that this text deals with impure love ("de amor impudico loquitur") and recommends the deletion of intimate, uncouth feelings or actions without going into detail.[23]

The Tridentine draft of *Rule* VII was only a draft prepared by the council fathers. *Rule* VII received its final version in Rome under the influence of the Roman Inquisition. Roughly twenty years later Constabile's and Di Dio's blacklists told of a more severe interpretation of *Rule* VII, and the Roman Inquisition admitted that *Rule* VII concerned so large a number of books that it was impossible to list them all.[24] Due to the immense impact of *Rule* VII, attempts were made to moderate it as early as the Council of Trent, though in vain.

The Venetian patrician Daniele Barbaro, bishop of Aquileia, suggested that texts by inexperienced young writers ought to be distinguished from texts composed by heretics, and judged accordingly, not on the basis of the same law.[25] No matter what poets like Petrarch, Boccaccio and sixteenth-century poets imitating them thought and felt about the love they described, this form of love as well as written descriptions of it were deemed sinful, a serious danger to the readers' salvation as, from the Catholic view, readers could be seduced to carnal desire through such love stories. People indulging in carnal desire and love were believed to distance themselves from God and be liable to commit yet more sins. For this reason, the reading of love poetry was considered the cause of several other sins ("multorum peccatorum causa"), as is made clear in a comment by Peña on Eymerich's inquisitorial manual.[26] What is more, those who sinned in carnal desire were said to be denied access to God's realm.

23 Cf. *Censura super Decameron*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 360r–1v, 360v.

24 See Fragnito and above Ch. 3.1.

25 Cf. *Concilii Tridentini Epistularum*, 251.

26 Cf. Eymerich/Peña, Q. 27 c. 52/315.

They would not obtain celestial beatitude. This view is explained by Inquisitor Alfonso de Castro on the basis of letters of St Paul (1 Cor. 6, Gal. 5, Rom. 14).[27]

Paradoxically, numerous books containing lascivious elements were still printed and sold in the second half of the sixteenth century. This gives the impression that the Roman censorial authorities were not able to realize their censorship policy, or that they were reluctant to take a stand. There was truth in the Roman Inquisition's statement that the number of books concerned was indeed large and constantly growing. It must have been difficult, if not impossible, for the censorial authorities to keep up with the book market in all the Catholic countries, given the means available to exercise such control at that time. Yet there may have been several other reasons for this seemingly paradoxical situation.

First, cases such as the censorship of *Orlando furioso* and *Decamerone* show that books of literary value were to be treated with a certain tolerance, or what was understood as tolerance from the censorial perspective. Second, all aspects of the book market must be considered. It does not suffice to observe that books with lascivious or obscene contents were printed and published; the circumstances of publications have to be carefully taken into account such as the editors' and printers' functions and their relationships to public authorities, printing privileges, the role of patrons and, of course, the composition of the editions. It is well known that collections and anthologies of love poems contain hidden *canzonieri* and refrain from naming the names of all contributing authors.[28] Third, the severe censorship laws aimed at intimidating poets, warning them of dealing with sinful carnal love and sexuality. Such politics sought to manipulate the work and development of contemporary poets. As the development of vernacular poetry and poetic theory in the second half of the century shows, this approach was successful. Even when new books on the subject of love appeared, the theme was approached considerably differently from how it had been portrayed in the first half of the century.

5.1 On Freedom and 'Reality' of the Word

Words ("verba") were a censor's main instrument. They opened the door to the author's mind. Notoriously, the control of words was crucial to the censorship of poetry. It was of particular interest in love poetry where religious language

27 Cf. Alfonso a Castro, *Adversus omnes haereses, libri XIV* (Antwerp: In aedibus viduae et haeredum Ioannis Stelsii, 1565), iii, 90r.

28 See Ch. 7.1.

was employed to describe erotic desire and feelings. One reason was the Catholic perspective on the meaning of certain words in religious language. This is clear from earlier examples in which censors revealed how their relation to words was influenced by their faith. Insight into their thoughts on word choice elucidates not only their approach to understanding vernacular love poetry, it also brings into play another aspect of censorship: freedom of verbal expression. Such censorship caused contemporary poets to speak up against restriction and dictation.

It is, of course, no secret that religious language was frequently used in vernacular love poetry, in particular in the Middle Ages. What is considered less often is that religious language lessened in Petrarchist works during the sixteenth century. It did not disappear completely, however, and where it remained it captured the attention of the Roman censorial authorities. It is also known that religious language was censored. Single words were censored, crossed out, and sometimes substituted. What is important is what lay behind such censorship: the handling of the word. Expurgated works, and, if extant, documents on them, demonstrate sensibility and, to a certain extent, tolerance towards poetic language. It is true that an expurgated work such as Dante's *Vita Nuova* appears to be evidence of ruthless intervention, even if internal documents suggest that expurgated texts would only have been considered a lenient compromise that tolerated but did not necessarily overlook impure elements. If censorship legislation had been fully applied, the outcome would have been even more enormous. Similar cases are those of Luigi Pulci's *Morgante*, Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*,[29] Speroni's *Dialogo d'amore*, and Antonfrancesco Doni's *Mondi celesti, terrestri e infernali*, *Zucca* and *Filosofia morale*.[30]

Even tiny passages were suppressed with the intention of cleansing the text of traces of irreverence towards the Roman Church, Catholic faith and theology, quotations or characters taken from canonical texts from the Bible and references to condemned authors. Pulci's *Morgante* was published in a new form, repentant and amended ("tutto pentito et emendato dei suoi passati errori") by Bartolommeo Sermartelli.[31] The same printer produced the new *Vita Nuova* and praised it as a work to be valued as one of the first and outstanding testimonies of the vernacular tongue ("composizione de' primi e maggior lumi della nostra favella"). It had been reduced to an ordinary literary text about a

29 For details and documents on *Il Cortegiano* see Appendix, doc. 1.7, 1.7g, 1.9 and, of course, Cian and Coseriu.

30 On Doni's works see Appendix, doc. 1.7, 1.7h, i, k, n.

31 Cf. Luigi Pulci, *Il Morgante* (Florence: Bartolommeo Sermartelli, 1574), see Sorrentino, *La letteratura italiana*, 327, 334–6, cf. Coseriu, 70–2.

profane love story and was to be considered as such. The *Morgante* appeared in the same year as Constabile's May 1574 prohibition; *Vita Nuova* followed two years later.

Unreasonable religious scruples, Michele Barbi explains, were the reason for the purged edition of *Vita Nuova*.[32] Is this all one can say? Before the expurgation the sacred and profane spheres were mingled. Boundaries, so important and guarded by censors, were blurred. By erasing religious elements, the connection between the sacred and profane was severed. It is almost impossible to imagine that censors and correctors were not aware of this effect, but what would it have meant if they had been aware of it? Control of the word went hand in hand with control of content, whereby content included ideas and thinking. Here, Speroni's case is informative because language played an important role, and there are documents of both the censor and author.

To start from the censor's perspective, the anonymous censor criticized Speroni for using words incorrectly. It was not only words that had specific meaning in the religious world but other things as well. Speroni describes affects and effects of positive love such as joy, happiness, miraculous effects, highest pleasure and good. As the censor understood these affects and effects to be sins and dishonesties, he was not willing to tolerate such descriptions. This censorship sprang from divergent ideas of love, and divergent ideas were related to adequate choice of words. While Speroni believed his description to be good, the censor had a different opinion. However pure Speroni's idea of love may have been, it did not match the Catholic idea and should therefore not have been described in this way. This implied that love was to be thought of and experienced in a particular way. It implied a dictation of thought, feeling and experience of life, which relied heavily on the author. Personal, intimate freedom did not count and was of no interest. Speroni's book could infect others, and his convictions were considered sinful, which concerned his soul.

For the censor, belief and religion were of priority. In the manner of the pagans ("alla ethnica"), Speroni referred to Cupid as God and his mother as the kindest and most saintly goddess. The censor adds that Speroni wanted Cupid to be adored like a god, and that it was blasphemy not to do so.[33] This comment recalls Barrio's judgment on Sannazaro's *Arcadia* quoted above, but it goes further in that here the censor not only demonstrates his awareness of Speroni's choice of words, he stresses and explains it. Other examples are the words "relic" ("reliquia") and "tabernacle" ("tabernacolo"). He observes that Speroni

32 Dante, *Vita Nuova*, ed. Michele Barbi (Florence: Bemporad, 1932), 90.

33 For the document and case, see Appendix, doc. 1.1, and Speroni, *I Dialoghi di Messer Sperone Speroni* (Venice: Aldus, 1544), 32r.

said that the courtesan Tullia d'Aragona, as depicted by Bernardo Tasso in his *Rime*, would always be "adored" by the "Faithful of Love" ("fedeli d'amore"), thus comparing her to a relic in a tabernacle. Although the censor does not comment on the passage but only paraphrases it, the reason for the censorship seems obvious. The two words are used and, in the censor's view, abused in a profane context to the effect that the mortal woman who was a courtesan was sublimated and, through adoration, likened to God. The censor concludes his judgment with an overall comment on Speroni's way of speaking ("modo del dire"), remarking that a pagan individual would have written and spoken in a more sober manner ("sobriamente") than this teacher of love.[34]

An expurgated edition of Speroni's dialogues appeared in 1596. Evidently Speroni's correctors were of the same opinion as the anonymous censor. The comparison between the original and expurgated version shows that the words criticized in the *Avertimento* had been removed. The image of the adoration of Tullia had disappeared as well:

> 1544:
> Grazia: Nelle rime del Tasso, nelle quali, come reliquia in un tabernacolo, il nome, le laude et le virtù vostre saranno divotamente adorate da fedeli d'Amore. Tullia: Adoreran quei tali non la religione, ma il tabernacolo. Tasso: Dio voglia che questo mio tabernacolo non riesca un'opra di ragno. Ma sia che si vuole de versi miei. Io non son fuora di speranza, che quanti la loro arte biasimeranno, altri tanti loderanno et ammireranno il mio amore fermo et saldo come il diaspro, il quale è tale et sì fatto, percioché voi sete tale et sì fatta, cioè bella di corpo et d'animo, in maniera et sì tra loro proportionati, ch'a questo corpo null'altro animo, né a questo animo null'altro corpo che 'l vostro si confarebbe.[35]

> 1569:
> Grazia: Nelle rime del vostro Tasso, nelle quali l'honore, il nome, le laudi vostre saranno lette et cantate da chi di amor sentirà. Tullia: Et invidiate per aventura. Tasso: Sia che si vuole de versi miei, io non son fuor di speranza, che quanti da lor poca arte biasimeranno, altrettanti ammireranno il mio grande amore fermo et saldo come il diaspro, il quale è tanto, perché all'incontro voi siete tale et sì fatta, cioè bella di corpo et di animo sì

34 See Appendix, doc. 1.1.

35 Cf. Speroni, *Dialoghi* (Venice: Aldo Manuzio, 1544), 29r.

> tra se stessi proportionati, che a sì bel corpo null'altra anima, né a quest'anima corpo men si confarebbe.[36]

How Speroni deals with such criticism emerges from his apology. He begins in a seemingly humble tone, which does not keep him from defending himself and uttering his own opinions. He even dares engage in a discussion on the freedom of verbal expression, explaining that the accusations concerned words as defined by the Catholic cult. He refers to them as "sacrosanct words" ("vocaboli sacrosancti") and "religious words" ("parole religiose") that he had employed wrongly. He had been accused of attempting to exalt or sublimate ("esaltare", "magnificare oratoriamente") his profane material with the splendor of the spiritual. Apparently the master of the sacred palace, and perhaps his censor, had tried to understand Speroni's poetic purpose in using religious language, so they had investigated the textual context of the religious language and its meaning and come to the conclusion that it served to enhance his work. Speroni tries to make his readers understand that it is imitation: ". . . uso vocaboli sacrosanti, ho chi imitare ed a chi tenti di assimiglarmi." He continues by claiming that some people maintain that in dealing with "vain and bad things" ("cose vane e non buone") it is wrong to use religious words that liken the earthly to the divine.[37] He informs his friend Matteo Macigno, that his "accusers" in Rome had made no differentiation between what was literal and what was imitation.[38]

All writing, be it poetry, rhetoric or studies, was included in this form of censorship. It always involved the relation between language, or form, and content. Speroni was fully aware of the implication of Rome's censorship. He discusses the art of poetry and its study, as well as freedom, in his apology. Speroni speaks up against the codification of language by the Roman Church and emphasizes freedom of style, that is, the freedom to choose one's personal mode of expression. His first example is the word "God" ("Dio"), which he utilizes to describe love in his dialogue on the dignity of women, which had been criticized on exactly that ground: "Amore è Dio ottimo e massimo . . . onde si è

36 Cf. Speroni, *Dialoghi del Signor Speron Speroni, nobile Padovano*, di nuovo ricoretti, a, quali sono aggiunti molti altri non più stampati e di più l'apologia de i primi (Venice: Roberto Meietti, 1596), 28–9.

37 Cf. Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, in id., Opere (Venice: Domenico Occhi, 1740) i, 301–2 and 311.

38 See Pozzi, 484s.

fatto sì grande romore e veramente a gran torto; percioché a dirlo non fu egli il primo."[39]

In order to explain his understanding of "Dio", Speroni considers its meaning in another epoch and cultural context. He argues that it had been used in ancient times by classical poets such as Homer and Hesiod, as well as by historians ("storici") and philosophers, and teachers of several saints. Neither in antiquity nor in his time had this aroused any religious scandal. Speroni states that it was common to use the word "Dio" to celebrate persons for outstanding qualities of the body, soul and fortune, and to erect temples and altars in their honor after their deaths. The opinion therefore emerged that there were many deities in the world. Speroni then shifts to the present to show that the ancient meaning of the word "Dio" and the expression "Amor è Dio" were still in use. Love was understood to be good and, accompanied by reason, the expression was suitable for partaking in the divine. In addition, Speroni argues, according to some of the Catholic saints the adjective "divine" ("divino") could refer to marvelous qualities. According to Speroni, the word did not necessarily refer to the divine sphere, a point on which he departs from contemporary dictionaries such as Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della volgar lingua*.[40]

He also briefly recalls the idea of the Christian God as true love and produces passages from the Sacred Scripture in which the Latin word "deus" refers to pagan deities and humans (Ps. 82.6, 96.5, 95.4, 136/135.2 and Gen. 6.2, Ex. 23:24, 22:18–19). With a quotation from Petrarch's *Trionfi*: "Fatto signor e Dio de gente vana" (*TC* I), Speroni returns to the use of the word in the context of poetry, where love is frequently called "Dio". Likewise, adjectives such as "very good" and "greatest" ("ottimo," "massimo") were also acceptable. This context of poetry is the context in which he wished "Dio" to be understood. He points to the general habit of speaking and acting ("la consuetudine del parlare e dell'operare"), a method of expression that defended the speaker.[41] Speroni argues that language and human reason do not suffice when discussing God or inspiring marvel.

In order to make a connection to the art of good writing ("arte del bene scrivere"), he picks up on reproaches made by critics whom he does not name but who were likewise to be found in ecclesiastical circles. They advised him not to combine eloquence with a serious argument; rather, he should concentrate on expressing the truth in honor of God and in service of a neighbor without hoping for fame and glory:

39 See Speroni, *Apologia*, 301–3 and 296.

40 Ibid. 299–300.

41 Ibid. 299–301.

> Dicono adunque: tu non puoi tanto acquistare l'arte apprendendo della eloquenzia, quanto tu perdi nello acquistarla colle bestemmie. quello è guadagno di uno artificio di parolette, per non dire ciancie, senza le quali in una anima può esser senno e bontà, ma questa è perdita dei costumi, dello onore, delle virtudi, e finalmente del paradiso: né par che possa avvenire, che alcun scrivendo ad ognora di cose turpi ed infami, tutto ad un tempo con uno istesso esercizio non sia per farsi egualmente buono oratore e reo uomo. Meglio è dunque d'assai lasciando l'arte del bene scrivere con male modo imparata, semplicemente dir sempre il vero in onor di Dio e in servigio del prossimo, senza speranza che fama e gloria gliene succeda.[42]

In order to refute this criticism, Speroni quotes from Cicero's *De oratore*, where Cicero recommends that one should indulge in exercises on praise, interpretation, correction, and criticism, and discuss everything from different standpoints.[43] Speroni argues that this is exactly what he had done in his dialogues. As he explains in the first part of the *Apologia*, the dialogue is similar to comedy, a form through which different characters are depicted with different positions and views. To strengthen his position, Speroni enters the field of theology by bringing Greek and Latin saints into play such as Gregory the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil the Great and John Chrysostom. In their writings, he states, one can find both holiness and elegance ("egualmente di santità ed eleganzia"), and Speroni knew how to account for this. He explains that Lactantius had employed the art of oratory ("ars oratoria") most diligently to express sacred things ("cose sacre") because the diligent use of language was a technique or doctrine ("dottrina") that could serve as sword and shield to anyone who knew how to write elegantly.[44]

Regarding profane poetry, Speroni concludes that Lactantius's art was no different than religious mysteries because clothes, vases, and sounds and chants used by priests during sacrifices in honor of God were often gifts from sinners used to adorn profane feasts. Also, he adds, the Roman Church used poetry in its sermons, and the Sacred Scripture, such as the psalms or verses of Job's dialogue in the Book of Job, was partially written in poetic form.[45] Speroni was not willing to accept the idea that artful writing and poetry were not to be used to discuss a serious subject matter.

---

42 Ibid. 305.

43 Ibid. Cicero, *De oratore*, I, 34, 158.

44 See Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, 306.

45 Ibid.

To Speroni, the separation of the sacred and profane implied severe language control. He insists that everyone ought to be free to use language, including so-called sacrosanct words, with their original, unreligious meanings. The word "tabernacolo," criticized in his *Dialogo d'amore*, is introduced as an example. Its original meaning was "padiglione," "pavilion" or "tent", and only subsequent metaphors had promoted the word to something higher. For this reason it should have been possible to utilize the word's original meaning.[46] Although Speroni's point was valid, his argument does not really defend his use of the word. In his *Dialogo d'amore*, "tabernacolo" describes Bernardo Tasso's *Rime*, in which Tullia d'Aragona was said to be adored like a relic by the future Faithful of Love. It is therefore hard to believe that Speroni employed only the profane meaning of the word.

A delicate background context is referred to when Speroni discusses the word "chaos". He explains that at one time it had been used in poetry, but that it was now considered heresy to say that God had created the world out of nothing. This word was supposed to be avoided by Christians, but it was actually in a hymn used by the Roman Church.[47] At first sight this argument seems merely a cynical interjection that serves to conclude this theme, yet Speroni uses this example to indirectly question the principles or consistency of censorship, and possibly even the Roman Church. "Chaos" might simply have been the best example he could think of, but his discussion went far beyond.

Speroni was familiar with the word "chaos" from another religious context where it had a particular meaning for him as well as someone else. "Il Chaos" was the academic name of no other than the great Counter-Reformer Saint Charles Borromeo, cardinal archbishop of Milan and president of the Vatican Academy at the Apostolic Palace, as we are told by Cardinal Agostino Valier in the first lines of his *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*.[48] By the time Speroni was interrogated, he, too, was one of its members, giving lectures at its gatherings in the presence of the pope. Cardinal Valier, who Borromeo had commissioned to provide a treatise on ecclesiastical rhetoric, was also a member.[49] An important and powerful connection between the Vatican academy and the Roman censorial authorities comes to light and, if Speroni made this rhetorical move,

46 Ibid. 302.

47 Ibid.

48 See Valier, *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, 1.

49 Ibid., *Ragionamento di Sperone Speroni sopra le sentenze: Ne quid nimis* and *Nosce te ipsum* and *Ragionamenti: Dell'amor de se stesso* 1–11, in Valier, *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, in *Noctes vaticanae*.

it is possible that a reference to Borromeo was meant to be implied. If this is the case, one may speculate that in his *Apologia* Speroni indirectly addresses a particular person he had in mind as a reader such as someone with connections to the Vatican academy. Moreover, he may have suspected the denouncer of his dialogues to have been part of that particular environment.[50]

Grave consequences may have resulted for works by Petrarch and poets writing about love in a Petrarchist style following Constabile's interrogation of Speroni at the Roman Inquisition. Speroni based his argumentation on sacred and secular authorities such as Scripture and works of the saints and Church Fathers and in regard to poetic models, particularly Petrarch. Speroni repeatedly referred to Petrarch to as a model he had used for the mingling of the sacred and profane in his work, and explained that such mingling was common with poets. Thus, unless no evidence to the contrary is provided, one cannot exclude that Speroni's interrogation and discussion of religious language and imagery in his works drew the attention of Constabile, who at the time was in charge of the censorship of all vernacular poetry. It hardly seems a coincidence that religious language played such an important role in the judgments on Petrarch and Petrarchist poets, as I will show below. It raises the question of how poetry of the medieval *Sweet New Style* (*Dolce Stil Nuovo*) was or would have been perceived in Rome. Petrarch owes much to this method of poetic composition, but the sources of the Roman censorial authorities have kept silent on these works until now.

The discussion on language was so crucial that even censors spent time on linguistic reflexions; it was almost as though they viewed the world as being composed of words. This may in fact not have been such a strange idea to them because the significance of words was explained through the power of the Word in the Catholic faith. The Sacred Scripture declares that the world had been made from God's Word (Psalm 32), understood to be Christ. Writers had been inspired by the Holy Ghost to write the Sacred Scripture, God's word. The liturgical or sacred language of the sacraments led to controversies between Catholics and Lutherans questioning the meaning of liturgical words, their effects and the essence of their nature as historical or sacred. The Catholic Eucharist relies on bread and wine being transformed into Christ's body and blood through consecration by sacred words. Words ("verba") as well as things

50 On his denouncer, see the introduction to Appendix, doc. 1.1.

("res") of the sacraments were believed to have been instituted by God and were not to be altered, as Robert Bellarmine explains.[51]

It thus becomes clear why the assessment of language was a complicated undertaking. A final example illustrates a censor's linguistic reflections. Since the word "Dio", as discussed by Speroni, was at the center of the assessment, and as this example is also part of Barrio's censorship of Petrarch, one must ask how Barrio's judgments were linked to the censorship of the love poets in the early 1570s.

The use of language among vernacular writers was the principal subject matter of Barrio's introduction to his Petrarch files. He complains about writers in general who confused words. Barrio claims that poets utilized incorrect vernacular derivations of the word "deus", such as "dio", "idio" or "iddio" rather than "Deu". He maintains that in so doing they profaned the name of God because those words had no meaning in Latin, and a different meaning in Greek: "idios," he explains, means "private" and the Greeks called their god "Theon". "Dio," he corrects the poets, is the genitive of 'Zeus,' Latin for 'Jupiter' or 'Jove,' son of Saturn. One was not to profane the name of God by ascribing anything to the pagan deity Zeus that pertained only to God, as that would be idolatry, which could become 'real' through language. It was not only the use of religious language in a profane context that made Barrio assess Petrarch as "a profane and lost author" ("profanus et perditus auctor"); what lay behind the word was also significant. In his view poets did not only combine words when they created a text, they also made something happen, intentionally or unintentionally. Barrio's position becomes clearer in the context of sacred language, as shown above, and when examining the word in canon law where sins of the tongue were judged a serious crime, as I will show in the following chapter.

5.2 Forbidden Goddesses

Goddesses, neither pagan nor supernatural, received particular attention in the censorships of Barrio and the anonymous *Avertimento* on Bembo, Sannazaro and Ariosto. The depiction of (seemingly) mortal women such as Petrarch's Laura being praised and adored in love lyrics was associated with the Catholic faith but assessed as nonconforming or heterodox. Possible autobiographical

51 Cf. e.g. Bellarmine, *De sacramentis in genere*, in id., *Disputationum Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, S.R.E. Cardinalis, De controversiis Christianae fidei, Adversus huius temporis haereticos*, tomus tertius (Paris: Ex Officinis Tri-Adelphorum Bibliopolarum, 1613), I, xxi.

elements were considered, along with poetic artistry and fiction, but the judgment was different from what one might expect.

Barrio studied sonnets *RVF* 3 and 4, in which the lover describes his love story and sublimates Laura poetically through words. In sonnet *RVF* 4 Barrio discovered local and temporary indications alluding to the Christian history of salvation. In his censorship of Petrarch, he points to the description of Laura's place of birth as "un picciol borgo" (*RVF* 4.12) and censors it because he views it as a comparison between Laura and Christ: "In hac enim cantilena comparat lauram christo." He considers it a nefarious comparison ("nefaria comparatio").[52] Further, since the poet says that the sun was obscured on the day of his *innamoramento* (*RVF* 3.1–3), Barrio understands that the poet fell in love with Laura on Good Friday, the day of Christ's crucifixion, probably because, according to St Luke, the eclipse of the sun was said to have taken place on that day (Luke 23:45). This analogy was deemed unacceptable and used as further evidence against the poet.

Barrio's interpretation sounds logical, but there are others. While Vellutello conformed to Barrio's reading,[53] Castelvetro expressed doubts that the indicated day was Good Friday, arguing that Easter Monday was the day of the poet's *innamoramento*. It appears that Castelvetro endeavored to direct the reader's attention away from analogies between Laura and Christ; before picking up the well-known interpretation of the *innamoramento*, he quoted from a range of other texts, particularly of the classical poets, in order to show that the eclipse of the sun was not only referenced in the story of Christ's crucifixion. Referring to Jeremiah 15:9 and Amos 8:9, Castelvetro reminds his reader that the eclipse was also found in other stories of the Sacred Scripture where God threatens to bring great affliction upon mankind. He explains that Petrarch calls the day night, that is, a day without sunlight, in order to express his pain over Laura's death ("grandezza dell'afflizione sua per la morte di Laura"), as in sonnet *RVF* 282 (vv. 1–2) or sestina *RVF* 323 (vv. 29–30).[54] Further examples were

52 See Appendix, doc. 1.3b. On intertextual relations between this verse and the Sacred Scripture see Silvia Chessa, *Il profumo del sacro nel Canzoniere di Petrarca* (Florence: Società Editrice Fiorentina, 2005), 334, cf. B. König, 'Sole e oscurità. Su significato e funzione "architettonico" di un motivo iconografico nel *Canzoniere* di Petrarca', *Quaderni petrarcheschi*, 14 (2004), 125–45, 131, Noyer-Weidner, 'Il nome di Laura nel *Canzoniere* petrarchesco: intorno all'enigma onomastico del sonetto V ed alle sue funzioni poetiche', in *Literarhistorische Begegnungen. Festschrift zum sechzigsten Geburtstag von Bernhard König*, ed. A. Kablitz and U. Schulz-Buschhaus (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993), 293–309, 298.

53 Cf. Vellutello, 2r–v.

54 Cf. Castelvetro does not share this opinion, id., *Le rime del Petrarca, brevemente esposte per Lodovico Castelvetro* (Venice: Antonio Zatta, 1756), i, 17–22.

introduced to reinforce this position, such as Statius's *Thebaid* (I.10), Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (IV.200–3) and Virgil's *Georgics* (I.164).

By contrast, Barrio did not take other interpretations into account. The portrayal of Laura as a character emanating light, recalling the female character of light in Giacomo da Lentini,[55] may have prevented him from doing so. The poet explicitly referred to her as a "sun" ("sol" *RVF* 4.12), using an expression reminiscent of Christ, the "light of the world" (John 8.12). The two commentators Vellutello and Daniello explained the description of Laura as a "sun" as being due to her beauty,[56] and Barrio picked up on this analogy. He states that the poet mentions two suns, Laura and Christ, rendering Laura the poet's other, or second, sun ("laura sua alter sol"). Barrio concludes that Laura and Christ had been put on the same level and that Laura's assimilation with Christ was based on an idea crucial to Petrarch's love concept, namely that Petrarch sought salvation through this mortal woman.[57]

Evidently, Barrio viewed Laura as a second savior holding a position comparable to that of Christ. Barrio must have conceived a picture of Laura similar to that of Beatrice in *Vita Nuova*,[58] who was said "to operate in marvelous" and "virtuous ways" ("mirabilmente" and "vertuosamente operando") in the hearts of other people. She had the power to create good love ("caritas") even in hearts that knew no love, and to transform them and make them noble. This picture, critics argue, was not Christian, for in Christian faith such power is ascribed only to God.[59] This position matches Barrio's judgment and raises the question as to how poetry prior to Petrarch would have been judged where the angel-like lady and other types of female savior characters appeared, such as works of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo*, the Sicilian tradition and troubadour lyrics.

Another motif of sonnet *RVF* 4, where Barrio might have found further evidence for his interpretation of Laura, could be Petrarch's reference to Christ's descent from heaven that alluded to his divine task of enlightening others ("a' illuminar le carte," *RVF* 4.5). In John (6:41) Christ says: "I am the bread that came

55 Cf. Michael Bernsen, *Die Problematisierung lyrischen Sprechens im Mittelalter. Eine Untersuchung zum Diskurswandel der Liebesdichtung von den Provenzalen bis zu Petrarca* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2001), 284.

56 See Vellutello, 3r. See also *Sonetti, Canzoni e Triomphi*, con la spositione di Bernardino Daniello da Lucca (Venice: per Giovanniantonio de Nicolini da Sabio, 1541), 3r–v.

57 Petrarch, *RVF* 306.1–2, on Petrarch, cf. König, 134, 142s.

58 On analogies between Beatrice and Christ in *Vita Nova* see Marco Santagata, *Amate e amanti. Figure della lirica amorosa fra Dante e Petrarca* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1999), 50–2.

59 Cf. Domenico De Robertis's comment in Dante, *Vita Nuova*, ed. id. (Milan: Ricciardi, 1980), 137 as well as Santagata, 24–7 and 44, on the motif of the angel-like and marvelous nature in poetic tradition, ibid. 29.

down from heaven," the bread through which man and God could be united and through which man could obtain eternal life. Christ adds: "I am the living bread that came down from heaven; whoever eats this bread will live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." (John 6:51) The motif of Christ's descent from heaven in *RVF* 4 was not censored but, as it was strongly linked to the criticized comparison between Laura and Christ, it may have been an element of Barrio's argumentation. Through the comparison and the reference to Christ's descent, Christ's origin as well as his salvational task and power were indirectly projected onto Laura.

By contrast, in *Vita Nuova*, Beatrice is said "to appear to have come from heaven" in order to show miracles ("e par che sia una cosa venuta / da cielo in terra a miracol mostrare"). According to Marco Santagata this information does not add much to the traditional portrayal of the "angel-lady" ("donna-angelo").[60] For a censor, however, this detail was important as it combined pagan, heretical and Christian beliefs as noted by Antonio Ciccarelli, censor of the Neo-Platonic *Dialogo della bellezza* by Niccolò Vito de Gozze of Dalmatia.

Ciccarelli found the same motif of celestial descent in Vito's dialogues on love and beauty in the description of a mortal woman with a salvational task, as in *Vita Nuova*. Ciccarelli's document on Vito's dialogue provides insight into the reception of the motif. He assesses it as an "error": "Errore 16 (=17), 35. facie 2 Voi siate un [sic] Dea scesa dal cielo quà giù nel mondo per mostrare il bene, et il bello che là su gl'angeli et l'anime beate godono." Ciccarelli corrects Vito and remarks that the idea of a soul descending from heaven had been found in Plato and Origen and condemned by the Roman Church. It was also common in Gnosticism, where we find the idea of a female figure of light, Sophia, who is believed to have descended from heaven and, in this aspect, appears to be similar to the poets' ladies, yet Ciccarelli makes no mention of this religious movement in his list of errors:

> Errore 11:
> A carta 22. facie prima. T. Grande amore è questo che voi mi portate mia dolce Gondolina. Onde crederò ch'Iddio ti ha mandato qui in terra. (merce la sua divina gratia) per mostrare di nuovo al mondo quanto effetto può l'amore fra due ch'in amore sono coniunti. M. Sia quel che si voglia, io mi contento del nostro amore perché tengo che questo sarà possente di ridurci da questa trista è tenebrosa vita, alla migliore e più serena.
>
> [no comment by Ciccarelli]

60 Cf. Dante, *Vita Nova*, XXVI, *Tanto gentile*, 7–8, Santagata, 58.

> Errore 3:
> A carta.4 et 5 facie prima. M. Hor chi non crederà essendo voi tanto bella et così vaga, che l'animo vostro non sia disceso da i chori Agnelici. F. Se io sono discesa da i chori agnelici (come voi dite) conosco ch'anchor voi sete stata meco in quelle stanze beate delle quali insieme insieme partissimo per venire quà giù al mondo. M. Io di certezza non me ne ricordo ma voi ch'havete l'animo si purgato di ciò facilmente potete ricordarvi: Hor io prego la maestà d'Iddio, che ci conceda per sua gratia di potere insieme rivedere quelle stanze eterne della felicità nostra dalle quali partissimo per venire in questo mondo.
>
> [Ciccarelli's comment:] Che l'anime nostre habitassero in cielo et poscia descendessero in terra fu opinione di Platone seguita da Origene, ma dannata dalla Santa Chiesa alla quale parmi che questo autore tropo aderisca.
>
> Errore 15 [=16]
> A carta 34 f. 2. M. Poscia che mi havete dichiarato mia bella e dolce ~~Gondelina~~ fiore l'influentia di ciascuno pianeta celeste, credo anzi tengo di certo ch'havendo l'anima vostra fatto il passaggio dalli superiori Chori per venire qua giù al mondo etc.
>
> [Cicarelli's comment:] Questa è opinione di Platone et d'Origine nella quale habbiamo ripreso l'autore perché mostra tropo ad essa aderire.[61]

Of course, one cannot be certain that Barrio had the same background knowledge as Ciccarelli, but it cannot be excluded. In any case, Ciccarelli's censorship shows that, at least from a contemporary censor's view, Barrio's verdict was appropriate. It is no wonder that the motif of celestial descent was likewise found and censored in the texts of sixteenth-century Petrarchists. If the censors had been aware of the ladies' god-like roles, it is strange that the rich commentaries on Petrarch's lyrics paid little attention to it. This could be due to the heterodox meaning.

Twenty years before Barrio submitted his censorship of Petrarch to Sirleto, he had been more open about the comparison between Laura and Christ in his *Pro lingua latina*. The time chosen for the lover's *innamoramento*, Good Friday, was used to prove Petrarch's lack of faith. Barrio declares that Petrarch had presented himself as libidinous and intemperate by demonstrating familiarity

61 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.14b-c. The word 'Gondolina' was crossed out by Ciccarelli.

with the sacred but admitted to having fallen into 'sinful' love on the day of Christ's crucifixion, when he should have been inflamed by a pure love for Christ:

> Et tamen ipsemet iam sacris initiatus fatetur se in illius turpem amorem atque libidinem perdite exarsisse, et eo die, quo potissime immensa in Christum charitate accendi sibique compati, ac demum ab omni humana cogitatione, nedum a turpi animum abducere, et ad divina illius diei mysteria contemplanda omnino transferre debuisset, die, inquam, quo ipse Christus dei filius cruci suffixus pro nobis patiens expiravit. Quare haud dubie se ipsum omnium libidinosissimum et intemperatissimum fuisse ostendit cum se eius amore captum, eamque diu arsisse fateatur, cuius turpi amore nullus alius, ut ipse dicit, aliquando allectus fuerit, et eo die, quo, ut dixi, religioni solummodo intentissime vacare debuisset.[62]

In his censorship, however, Barrio lists another comparative structure through which Laura was likened to the Virgin Mary which he judges to be "profane". The basic analogy used for this comparison is Laura and Mary's beauty and a particular light emanating from both of them. In sonnet *RVF* 154, Petrarch describes the immense splendor, the "vivo lume" (*RVF* 154.3) of Laura's eyes. The light emitting from her is said to have a certain spiritual power which the lover believes "to inflame the air with honesty" ("L'aere percosso da' lor dolci rai / s'infiamma d'onestate," *RVF* 154.9–10). While contemplating this light, he feels a pure and sublime sentiment of honor and virtue (*RVF* 154.13) instead of the type of desire (*RVF* 154.12) mortal women usually arouse in men.

This picture of Laura was repudiated because Barrio was convinced that these characteristics ought to be reserved for the Virgin Mary, who alone should be considered the most beautiful woman and the only one to arouse virtue rather than lust ("concupiscentiam carnalem").[63] Dealing with sonnet *RVF* 154 in *Pro lingua latina*, Barrio states that Mary is the woman dressed in the sun ("sole vestita," Rev 12.1) in Petrarch's canzone to the Virgin.[64]

---

62 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 409.

63 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

64 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 409, Appendix, doc. 1.3b; on Petrarch, cf. J. Küpper, 'Palinodia e polisemia nella canzone alla vergine del Canzoniere. (Con alcune brevi considerazioni sulle condizioni della differenza tra arte classica ed arte moderna)', *Quaderni petrarcheschi*, 14 (2004), 147–90. On epiphany, see e.g. Elpidius Pax, *Epiphaneia: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie* (Munich: Zink, 1995), Jean Daniélou, 'Les origines de l'épiphanie et les Testimonia', *Recherches de sciences religieuses* LII, 1 (1964), 538–53, on epiphany in literature, see Rainer Zaiser, *Die Epiphanie in der französischen Literatur. Zur Entmystifizierung eines religiösen Erlebnismusters* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1995).

The question arises as to what Barrio made of these comparisons. A human female character emerges in whom the roles and characteristics of Christ and Mary combine. In order to better understand, Barrio, in *Pro lingua latina*, turns directly to Petrarch with an apostrophe, demanding an explanation from him.[65] In his censorship, however, such signs of uncertainty and helplessness are missing; Barrio concentrates solely on what the poet expressed in the literal sense. Besides the comparisons, Barrio observes that Petrarch explicitly referred to his Christ- and Mary-like Laura as "his idol" ("idolo mio", *RVF* 30.27) and confessed to adoring her on earth ("ch'i' adoro in terra," *RVF* 247.2).

Literally read, Laura can be viewed as a worshipped goddess; Petrarch even used the word "dea" to describe her (*RVF* 311.8, *Triumphus Mortis* 1.124: "o vera mortal dea").[66] This word was not quoted by Barrio but, on the basis of the usage of the expressions "idolo" and "adoro", he concludes that Petrarch had shamelessly presented himself as an idolater.[67] He accuses Petrarch of misguided worship ("latria") for, according to the Sacred Scripture, there is no other deity apart from God, and he alone is to be worshipped (Exod. 20:3–5, Matt. 4:10). Thus, through his judgment of idolatry, Barrio accuses the poet indirectly of having broken the Mosaic Law.

However, there is an ironic aspect to Barrio's judgment concerning one of the fundamental ideas on which the Petrarchan love concept was based. The lover confesses his idolatry, is aware of the impurity of his love and understands that his love must be purified; therefore, the lover knows that he has to overcome the error of his ways in order to receive salvation.[68] Since Barrio accused him of idolatry, one could assume that Barrio was overambitious and gave his judgment too hastily without considering the poet's intention and self-reflection, yet apparently this was not the case. Barrio understood the lover's awareness, as evident in his judgment on the poems *RVF* 364, 236, 84, 62, 176 and 244.[69] Barrio was less interested in an overall interpretation of the work than in what was said and why. In his view a sinner was not expected to expose his sins to the reader or to present them in a positive light, as the anonymous censor of the Petrarchist *Rime* had not tolerated the idea that the poetic form could excuse blasphemous utterances.

---

65 See Barrio, *PLL*, 409.

66 See Chessa, 336, quotation from *Trionfi* after: Petrarca, *Trionfi, Rime estravaganti, codice degli abbozzi*, ed. Vinicio Pacca and Laura Paolino (Milan: Mondadori, 1996).

67 See Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

68 Critics do not agree upon whether a process of purification is described in the *Canzoniere* or not. For an overview on different positions see Bernsen, ch. 8, in particular his perspicacious study 302–19.

69 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

Again it is striking that idolatry seems to have posed no problems for Petrarch's 'profane' commentators. In explaining sestina *RVF* 30, Castelvetro frankly declares that Petrarch referred to Laura as an idol because he adored her. Likewise, Vellutello makes no attempt to defend the poet's heterodox adoration of a woman. By contrast, Torquato Tasso deals with the theme of idolatry in a broader context of love poetry in *Il Cataneo ovvero degli idoli*. Tasso claims that a lover is like an idolater when he displays his love for a woman, and adds that poets commonly refer to their ladies as idols. He explains that idolatry may be compared to the love of a miser who idolizes his treasure, and anyone who fixates on a particular object or person could fall victim to idolatry. In this way, a loving soul could become a temple of idolatry.[70]

One may ask what consequences Barrio's judgment had on contemporary love poetry. Some critics have not been convinced that his judgment had any consequences at all because neither the *Canzoniere* nor *Trionfi* were explicitly prohibited in Italy in the 1570s.[71] It is nonetheless important to keep in mind that others repeatedly and rightly emphasized the significance of Counter-Reformation censorship practice for vernacular poets.[72] It is also important to single out censorship measures connected to Barrio's censorship. One should remember that Barrio understood Petrarch to be "a leader and teacher of dirty desire" ("dux et magister spurcarum libidinum") and considered his role and significance as a model to a large number of contemporary poets.[73]

When Barrio first published his views in *Pro lingua latina*, which was addressed to the political elite, he endeavored to warn people with political power of the diffusion of similar poetry even before the first Roman *Index* had been promulgated. This project was supported by Pope Julius III. In addition, the censorships he submitted to Sirleto, prefect of the Congregation for the Index, dated back to the early 1570s, approximately the same period during which Speroni had been interrogated by Constabile, his *Dialogi* had been censored and prohibited, and he had composed his apology. Both the censorships and apology addressed similar issues which Speroni discussed with Constabile who, due to his position as the master of the sacred palace, worked very closely with the Congregation for the Index, the Roman Inquisition and, of course, the pope.

---

70 Cf. Castelvetro, *Le rime del Petrarca*, parte prima, 93; Vellutello, 16r; Tasso, *Il Cataneo overo degli idoli*, in id., *Prose*, 190–3.

71 Cf. Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*', Godman, *The Saint as Censor*.

72 For instance, studies by Fragnito and Rozzo.

73 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3c, Barrio, *PLL*, 413–4.

The *Avertimento sopra le rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo et del Sannazaro* was composed during the same period, and examined very similar problems. Its anonymous author, well-versed in vernacular poetry, shared Barrio's interest, yet proceeded in a much more objective way, although it almost appears as if his examination was based on Barrio's results. By analyzing Bembo, Ariosto and Sannazaro, the anonymous censor chose three of Petrarch's imitators who were to shape the Petrarchist manner of writing throughout Europe and become model poets themselves. He endeavored to make clear that the "errors" and "sins" that he observed in these three works were also detectable in the works of other poets.[74] As the *Avertimento* was followed by the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime*, Barrio's activity could have been linked to this investigation and had implications on poetry. Bearing this in mind, it may be worthwhile to reconsider the significance and consequences of the censorship of Petrarch by beginning with another glimpse at the anonymous *Avertimento* on love poetry.

The *Avertimento* sheds new light on the censorial reception of the depiction of the praised ladies. Almost confirming Barrio's warning, the *Avertimento* opens with the general statement that it is a custom of vernacular poets to praise their ladies by making them goddesses. This statement gives the impression that the description of the ladies is treated as a poetic aspect, or a form of writing, rather than as a sin springing from the adoration of a mortal being or a heterodox belief.

This censor points out that in vernacular poetry, each lady is generally referred to as an idol ("idolo"), a goddess ("dea") or compared to a deity ("perché ella è come un Dio"). This observation is indeed correct as the angel-like woman with divine capacities can be found not only in poetry by Petrarch and his imitators but also in earlier medieval love poets.[75] To account for the deification of women, the censor states that the poets had followed their desire to create something special. He maintains that poets were in the custom of stating their adoration of women by referring to them as goddesses. Thus it seems that he did not believe the poets to have literally adored the ladies; rather, he considered the ladies' deification to be a form of poetic expression inherent in the texts.[76]

This censor might either have been familiar with love poetry or he might have found advice in the editions of the *Rime* used for his censorship. In Bembo's case, he used an edition prepared by Francesco Sansovino (Venice: Francesco Sansovino, 1561) in which each sonnet is accompanied by a brief

74 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2a, Barrio, *PLL*, 408–9, 414.

75 Cf. Chessa, 336, Santagata, see the chapter *La donna del miracolo*.

76 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2a.

comment, in which he might have found an indication that Bembo had imitated not only Petrarch but other medieval love poets as well. He would have understood that the sins in Bembo's *Rime* were, in fact, common with vernacular poets, and therefore spoke of customs. He seems to have considered matters of style, but did not go into detail; the word *stile*, even if defined differently at that time, was not used.

This approach did not protect poets from censorship. It was apparently not possible to excuse poets on the ground that sins were a problem of poetic language devices rather than religious convictions. This position is indirectly corroborated by Speroni's apology. The use of divine attributes to describe mortal women was found to be blasphemous, though not explicitly idolatrous. The sin of blasphemy covers a wide field that in this case might have encompassed a violation of the First Commandment.[77] The censor attached a list to his outline of vernacular love poetry in which he included quotations from the three Petrarchists Ariosto, Bembo and Sannazaro in order to demonstrate how they dealt with female divinity.

He cites "Mia Dea" (*S R* 17.8), "Quella sua Dea" (*S R* 75.93), for instance, from Sannazaro, as well as lines in which the poet explicitly confessed to adoring a beloved person who tormented him to death (*S R* 25.30–33). In addition, he draws attention to a verse in which the lady-goddess was said to have descended from heaven (*S R* 82.2), though without explaining the passage.[78] He apparently expected his readers to recognize the inherent problem and, like Ciccarelli, recalled that this idea, once expressed by Plato and Origenes and known to Manichaeism and Gnosticism, had been rejected by the Roman Church. He must also have noticed traces of idolatry. If Christ was said to have descended from heaven as the spiritual bread of Israel, then clearly, in the eyes of this censor, the lady referred to as a goddess of the same origin was being likened to Christ, rendering her portrayal more delicate than the indirect allusion to Laura and Christ, as Barrio had detected in Petrarch.

The censor may have found the same motif in Bembo's sonnet *B R* 2: "Donna scesa dal ciel vidi passarme" (*B R* 2.6), but he did not quote this verse, probably because the motif had already been demonstrated in Sannazaro. Instead, the censor noted that in Bembo the lover "consecrates" ("sacro") not only his poem—originally dedicated to Cardinal de' Medici—to his lady; he gives himself completely to her. (*B R* 92.3–4) The censor draws attention to the Dantesque

77 See *DG*, sec. pars, c. XXV, q. 1, c. 1, 4 and 5.

78 See Appendix, doc. 1.2e. Sannazaro, *Rime/Sonetti e canzoni*, in id., *Opere volgari*, ed. Alfredo Mauro (Bari: Laterza, 1961), hereafter *S R*.

expression "Dolce mia vaga angelica beatrice," whereby the lady was ascribed the power to beatify the poet and to make him experience beatitude.[79]

The depiction of the pagan cult of Venus of Bembo's *Stanze* is also among the listed passages. The censor quotes the lines in which the worship of the goddess is described (*B R Stanze* 2.3–6; 4.2; 36; 39.7.8). He identifies pagan superstition and idolatry in Bembo's *Stanze*, which, as such, was worthy of censorship. Although the censor is aware that the Stanze were written for a masquerade, he finds it worthwhile to point out that the sacred and profane are mingled.[80] It appears that this censorship is not related to the deified mortal lady, but may have been indirectly as it shows an interesting analogy to what the censor found in the depictions of the poet's lady and his love, perhaps emphasizing superstitious elements.

Several passages are quoted from Ariosto in order to trace the portrayal of the lady as the poet's goddess ("La mia Dea"), and her adoration (*Aventurosa man, beato ingegno* 4, *A R Cap*. 8.14, *Cap*. 18.39, *A R Sonetti* 9.8).[81] In addition, the censor found reflections of the poet that helped to explain the role of the lady. He quotes lines from the canzone *Amor de ch'ei ti piace*:

> Che la mia mente pur non la comprende
> perch'ella è com'un Dio.
> Ne la quale io comprendo
> quell'alme gratie, che nel cielo attendo (= *A Amor de ch'ei ti piac*e 16–17; 38–9)[82]

This quotation further elucidates censorial research strategy. It contains not only the already censored comparison between the lady and a deity, it also points to a comparison between the grace the poet recognizes in her and the grace he hopes to receive in heaven. Significantly, the word "comprendere," indicating the poet's attempt to understand the lady intellectually ("la mia mente"), is quoted twice. The form of the *Avertimento* suggests that this censor quoted in a very precise manner by listing only single words and verse segments; for instance, "la mia Dea" is usually only part of a verse. Reasons for this strategy might have either been the desire to indicate as clearly as possible

79 See Appendix, doc. 1.2c. I am quoting Bembo after Bembo, *Rime*, in id., *Prose della volgar lingua, Gli Asolani, Rime*, ed. Carlo Dionisotti (Turin: UTET, 1966), hereafter *B R*.

80 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2d.

81 Ibid. doc. 1.2b, Ariosto, *Rime di M. Lodovico Ariosto. Satire del medesimo con i suoi argomenti di nuovo rivedute et emendate* (Venice: Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari, 1560), 19r.

82 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2b. Ariosto, *Rime* (1560), 18v.

the problematic passages, or lack of time. So, if he copied entire lines instead of single words, he consciously drew attention to the entire statement.

The four lines quoted above describe the intellectual activity involved in the poet's love. The lady was considered not only as a mortal being but also as a divine-like being. The censor apparently detected the poet's belief or hope that his love was not only about blind carnal desire but would lead to the recognition and knowledge of God and eternal life. The means of achieving this was through the contemplation of a mortal woman. Ariosto's idea of love, as depicted here, not only matches the picture of the poet's idolatry, it actually makes it more precise.

In addition, the censor claims that all vernacular poets ascribed effects of divinity ("effetti della divinità") to the ladies. He states that the wind and the sea are said to be calmed by the ladies' presence, and that their presence makes clouds disappear and flowers bloom. One might be going too far by identifying this as an analogy to Christ's salvational power, but the censor presents his observation as a significant element of his argumentation. It elucidates the women's roles as goddesses and their effect and influence on the poets' emotional lives. Due to their love and the contemplation of the ladies' beauty, the poets claimed to experience supernatural happiness and pain that surpassed those inspired by heaven and hell. In Ariosto's sonnet *A R Sonetti* 5, for instance, the censor observes that the lover spoke of his lady's almost divine and fatal power to beatify her environment and entice him to fall in love with her.[83] From his perspective, a mortal woman had no such power. He might have been of the same opinion as Barrio, who claimed that the only woman capable of arousing virtue rather than lust was Mary.

In Bembo's *Rime*, the censor rejects the description of the lady as an "angelica beatrice." Since this censor quotes only one word at a time when he wishes to draw attention to only that word, it is noteworthy that, here, he quotes the entire verse "Dolce mia vaga angelica beatrice". In so doing, he points to the lady's role and the concept of love found here and possibly in other vernacular poems. He concentrates on the literal sense of the lady being likened to an angel with beatifying power. A few pages further, he encounters the expression again, accompanied by a very clear explanation of the lady's role in the poet's life:

> La dolce vista angelica beatrice
> de le mia vita, et d'ogni ben radice (*B R* 73.11–12).

83 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2a–b.

These lines confirm his interpretation, as the lady is said to be at the root of all good things. As this statement raises the question of God's place in human life, it becomes clear why the censor felt the need to mark it.[84]

The powerful role of the lady in the lover's life becomes evident when he believes and claims to have no control. The censor must have observed how this role was shaped through explicit references to fate, because he quotes passages in which Bembo and Sannazaro used the adjective derivatives of the word *fato* in order to describe the ladies, as in "fatal mio vivo lume" (*B R* 17.15) and "la mia fatal nemica" (*B R* 33.1). In Sannazaro, the lover explains overtly that it is not only the stars and heaven but also the lady that inspires love within him, although he admits to realizing that he has only himself to blame for his sins. By using this approach, the censor includes additional semantic fields relating to the subject of fate and superstition. If read in connection with his introduction, these censorships suggest that their author recognized the lover's belief to be determined by a power other than God.[85]

By assuming that it was only a custom of poets, for aesthetic reasons, to convey that they adored their ladies, the censor naturally arrives at the question of fictionality. He takes into account that the love described might in fact not have derived from true feeling, thereby admitting that he is unsure whether the poets had actually experienced their love or whether they had merely invented it. He was aware that the poems might not have been composed as autobiographical texts.[86] A similar thought can be traced in Bellarmine's *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*:

> Franciscus Petrarcha, patria Florentinus, Archidiaconus Parmensis, & Canonicus Patavinus, lusit aliquando elegantissimis versibus Italicis, amores suos erga Lauram, seu veros, seu confictos, ut habrete materiam exercendae Musae; sed poenitentia ductus & tempus in cantiunculis illis concumptum deflevit, & in solitudine positus vitam Christiano, & pio homine dignam egit & multa opera gravia, atque utilia scripsit, ac tandem pie, santeque, obiit anno Dom. 1374 aetatis suae septuagesimo.[87]

It is particularly noteworthy that an aspect of lyric poetry unclarified in contemporary poetics at that time was considered in censorship. In the second half of the sixteenth century, it was apparently unclear whether melic or lyric

84 Ibid. doc. 1.2c.

85 Ibid. doc. 1.2c, e.

86 Ibid. doc. 1.2a.

87 Cf. Bellarmine, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, 176.

poetry was to be defined as the imitation or narration of affects. The affects could be those of someone else, either imitated or invented, or those of the poet, in which case they were merely narrated.[88] Pomponio Torelli, author of *Trattato della poesia lirica* (1590), remarks that immoral verses do not necessarily reflect the author's immorality. Catullus, he argues, held that it was proper for a poet to be moral, but not necessarily in his works. Torelli also refers to Aristotle, who said that poetry reveals the author's way of thinking.[89]

It may seem strange, but the question of autobiographical truth was of little importance to the anonymous censor. In his view it made no difference whether the narrated sins were invented for poetic ends, fun or pastime. This position is close to that of Barrio's and calls to mind what Speroni experienced during his interrogation. It is the written word that matters, the word as an expressed thought uttered frankly and deliberately, like a deed.

5.3 Disillusioning the Lover

The effect of divine ladies and their love on poets was investigated in great detail by censors. From joy to bliss, from pain to sorrow, Petrarch and his three imitators Bembo, Ariosto and Sannazaro wrote of lovers experiencing emotions of paradoxical extremes during the process of purification.[90] The poets yielded to a sublimation of emotional experiences whereby the lovers hoped to be chosen for spiritual refinement and led to deification.[91] This entailed the sublimation of the lover himself, expressed poetically through the use of religious language and imagery. This approach caught the censors' attention, presumably making them aware of concealed, heterodox elements of the poetic concept of love. The closeness of these ideas to philosophy, theology and mysticism appears to have led to a new round of investigation into love poetry by the censorial authorities in the 1580s, roughly ten years after the major investigations of the 1570s. Medieval mysticism and Protestantism had again come into play.

88 Cf. Pomponio Torelli, *Trattato della poesia lirica* (*1590*), in *Trattati di poetica e retorica del Cinquecento*, ed. Bernard Weinberg (Rome: Laterza e figli, 1974), iv, 264, 266–8, 304–5, Minturno, 175.

89 Cf. Torelli, 264 and 313.

90 On the paradoxical structure of affects underlying the poetry of Petrarch and Petrarchists see Gerhard Regn, *Torquato Tassos zyklische Liebeslyrik und die petrarkistische Tradition. Studien zur* Parte prima *der* Rime (*1591/1592*) (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1987), ch. 2.1.

91 On diverging opinions on spiritual refinement in Petrarch see Bernsen, ch. 8.

Extreme emotional experiences in Petrarch were observed by Barrio in sonnets *RVF* 191 and 193 of the *Canzoniere*, where the lover describes the beatifying effect of the contemplation of Laura. He dwells on memories of her beauty and compares this vision to the *visio Dei*:

> Sì come eterna vita è veder Dio,
> né più si brama, né bramar più lice. (*RVF* 191.1–2)[92]

According to Petrarch's commentator Vellutello, the poet uses this comparison to explain the mechanism of contemplation;[93] as blessed souls in heaven experience beatitude through divine contemplation, so does the lover feel happy ("felice") whilst contemplating Laura (*RVF* 191.3). The lover's feelings extend well beyond ordinary happiness, however; he insinuates that he is experiencing beatitude rather than happiness. This is where the danger lies; the poet perceives his emotional experience as a kind of rapture, denying, at least momentarily, any greater experience,

> dolce del mio penser hora beatrice
> che vince ogn'altra speme, ogni disio (*RVF* 191.7–8).

A similarity is found in sonnet *RVF* 193. While the means of perception in sonnet *RVF* 191 is visual, the poet now expresses Laura's beauty through sound and taste, comparing her beauty to food ("cibo") deemed nobler than ambrosia and nectar. The poet believes himself to have experienced a rapture like that of Saint Paul's, and loses his sense of space: "rapto per man d'Amor, né so ben dove" (*RVF* 193.7). He makes it clear that it is his mind ("mente") that perceives her beauty, defining his love as spiritual rather than carnal:

> Pasco la mente d'un sì nobil cibo,
> ch'ambrosia et nectar non invidio a Giove;
> [ché, sol mirando, oblio ne l'alma piove

92 Cf. the first two lines of sonnet *RVF* 193: "Pasco la mente d'un sì nobil cibo / et nectar non invidio a Giove." For a lucid study of both sonnets 191 and 193 see Franz Penzenstadler, '"Sì come eterna vita è veder Dio" (*Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* Nr. 191)—Petrarcas Dekonstruktion stilnovistischer Poetik', in Klaus W. Hempfer and Gerhard Regn (eds.), *Petrarca-Lektüren*. Gedenkschrift für Alfred Noyer-Weidner (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003), 147–83.

93 Cf. Vellutello, 72r.

d'ogni altro dolce, et Lethe al fondo bibo.] (*RVF* 193.1–4, lines 3–4 are not quoted by the censor)

Barrio quotes only the first two lines of each sonnet where the results of the lover's feeling are narrated. The lover's feeling temporarily satisfies his desire; he wishes for nothing more. Barrio concludes that Petrarch had found beatitude and happiness in lust ("voluptas") according to the custom of Epicurus because the lover claimed to have found eternal happiness through the contemplation of Laura just as blessed souls experience eternal happiness through the contemplation of God ("visio Dei").[94]

This interpretation of sonnet *RVF* 193 shows that, despite the absence of a reference to the Christian God, Barrio recognized the concealed reference. In *RVF* 193, the poet confesses that the particular sweetness of his feeling causes him to forget everything else, referring to every other "sweetness" ("d'ogni altro dolce"). "Sweetness" understood in relation to ambrosia and nectar refers to the divine sphere, and has a similar meaning in Christianity in reference to God (e.g. Psalm 19:9–10). The lover's reference to the divine could therefore be interpreted allegorically in a Christian context, particularly if sonnet *RVF* 193 is read, as by Barrio, in the light of the preceding sonnet *RVF* 191. If one was willing to make the connection between Jupiter and God, one could also connect ambrosia and nectar to spiritual bread from heaven, namely Christ (cf. John 6:41 and 51). Such an interpretation led Barrio to perceive the poet as comparing and preferring carnal desire to divine love and God.

Barrio further declares that Petrarch located his beatitude and happiness in lust, as was the Epicurean habit, although Epicurus had held that beatitude was to be found in *ataraxia*, a more peaceful experience than libido. In the second version of the censorship, Barrio added the name of Aristippos of Cyrene.[95] His judgment implies a severe accusation; not only did the Roman Church consider Epicurus's teaching contradictory to its faith, but some Church Fathers equated Epicureans to Gnostics,[96] an idea still present in the sixteenth century. In his inquisitorial manual, Alfonso de Castro describes "heresies of beatitude." The second heresy, Castro states, is to find beatitude in carnal desire ("in carnis

94 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

95 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3e. For Epicurus and Aristippos see M. Hossenfelder, *Epikur* (Munich: Beck, 1991).

96 Cf. Henry A. Fischel, *Rabbinic Literature and Graeco-Roman Philosophy: A Study of Epicurea and Rhetorica in Early Midrashic Writings* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 10.

delitiis"); he explains that it was once common among Jews and believed by the Gnostic Cerinthus.[97]

A very dangerous accusation was put forward, suggesting that Petrarch's description contravened the faith, and insinuating heresy for the second time following the accusation of Priscillianism. It is striking that Barrio made no mention of Gnosticism or other beliefs closer to Christian faith aside from Epicurean teachings. As he made no effort to distinguish between Petrarch the man and Petrarch the lover-poet, as had the anonymous censor, Barrio's judgment could imply that Petrarch the man had had heretical inclinations.

The accusation of comparing a carnal affect to celestial beatitude was severe because, from the theological point of view, beatitude was spiritual, only partially experienced in this world and could only be experienced through divine love, implying knowledge of God and divine truth. Its form of perfection, celestial beatitude, was the goal of salvation and could only be achieved in the afterlife. It was believed that a soul connected to God through his *lumen gloriae* was able to experience the *visio beatifica*, the vision of God and divine truth.[98] Likewise, happiness was considered a spiritual and divine gift; Barrio could not accept that it was attainable through carnal experience. According to Augustine, earthly beatitude ("beatus esse") meant the acquisition of knowledge or wisdom of God ("sapientia Dei," 1 Cor. 1:24).[99] This could be regarded as "good will" ("bona voluntas"), leading a virtuous life for the purpose of serving and contemplating God. Barrio makes clear the importance of beatitude and the *visio beatifica* to the Catholic faith. Any distortion of this concept was considered dangerous, such as Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. According to Barrio, Petrarch likened carnal experience to spiritual rapture and a perception of divine truth.

The manner in which affects were depicted sheds further light. Such depictions aimed at the sublimation of affects, reflecting the sublimation of the lover-poet. This did not escape Barrio's eyes. The poet claims to have experienced a form of love similar to the love and faith that the two converted sinners, Mary

97 Cf. Alfonso de Castro, 89r, on Cerinthus see also St Irenaeus, *Libros quinque adversus haereses*, ed W. Wigan Harvey (Cantabrigae: Typis Academicis, 1857), I.21.

98 See 1 John 3.2, Matt. 5.8, Christian Trottmann, *La vision béatifique: des disputes scolastiques à sa définition par Benoît XII* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1995), see ch. IV, ii, cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, in S. *Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*, ed. Roberto Busa SJ (Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt: Frommann und Holzboog, 1980), pars 2, II, 12, 4–5, id., *Summa contra gentiles*, ibid., I, 101–2.

99 See Volker Henning Drecoll, *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 35; cf. Augustine, *De beata vita*, in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Contra academicos, De beata vita, De origine, De magistro, De libero arbitrio*, ed. M. Green (Turnhout: Brepols, 1970).

Magdalene and Peter, had felt for Christ (*RVF* 95.12–13), yet the poet recognizes that there is a difference between their love and his; their love had led to salvation, whereas his results in pain. This is possibly an indirect confession that he believes his love to be good but in need of purification. Barrio found this to be a profane comparison ("comparatio profana") by distinguishing between the profane carnal love found in Petrarch and the divine love of Mary Magdalene and Peter. His comment does not initially reveal his findings:

> Così potess'io ben chiudere in versi
> ....
> Lasso, non a Maria, non nocque a Pietro
> la fede, ch'a me sol tanto è nemica . . . (*RVF* 95.1 and 12–13)
>
> Profana comparatio. Comparat enim suum carnalem in Lauram affectum Magdalenae et Petri in Christum amori ac fidei.[100]

Petrarch, of course, utilized names and elements from the New Testament, and the comparison between the poet and the two biblical characters implied a silent comparison between Laura and Christ. More importantly, the poet ascribed a pure form of love to himself, indirectly elevating himself to a purer state closer to God and his deification. As discussed above, however, such elevation and deification was not possible through carnal desire from the censorial perspective.

Barrio delves more closely into the description of the poet. Whilst making no mention of Elijah's carriage of fire in canzone *RVF* 206 (v. 59), he presents another piece of evidence of the poet's sublimation in line 55 and demonstrates where he set his priorities. His censorship was not about whether the poet borrowed elements from Scripture but, rather, whether he focused on substance and matters of faith. The lover apologizes for having once loved another woman, and concludes the song by explaining that by loving Laura, he had served not Leah but Rachel ("Per Rachel ho servito, et non per Lia," *RVF* 206.55).[101]

Vellutello, one of Petrarch's commentators, may have assumed that the reference to the second woman, Leah, was merely a reference to another mortal woman. Vellutello mentions the intertextual reference of this verse to the Old Testament (Gen. 29), but offers no explanation as to allegorical implications.[102]

---

100 See Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

101 Ibid.

102 Cf. Velutello, 105r.

Barrio, however, did acknowledge the concept underlying the intertextual relation. He points directly to the comparison between the Petrarchan lover and the patriarch Jacob, and this time his judgment is more severe than in the previous comparison. Barrio finds this comparison to be not only profane ("profana") but also nefarious ("nefaria").[103] Asking why Barrio judged this comparison differently from the previous one of sonnet *RVF* 95 may help to further elucidate Barrio's reading practice. In both poems names of biblical characters are used and forms of love are compared. If the difference between the judgments was not due to negligence, then Barrio must have perceived an inherent difference in meaning. It is possible that the difference lay in the characters of Jacob, Mary Magdalene and Peter. They have different roles in biblical and Christian history, carry different meanings in Christian exegesis and are to be considered accordingly.

Barrio's censorship includes another "nefarious" comparison, this time between profane happiness, the typical paleness of profane lovers, and paradisiacal happiness, the mutual smile of the blessed souls in (*RVF* 123.1–8) that led Barrio to express his dismay: "Pro pudor, quam profana et nefaria haec comparatio. comparat enim in hac cantilena amantium cupidineum pallorem et risum mutuo beatorum in paradiso gaudio."[104] Here, the divine, or sacred, is compared to the profane. This may explain why Barrio refers to this comparison as profane and nefarious ("profana et nefaria"), and it is fair to assume that this view was also applied to the comparison in canzone *RVF* 206.

Twenty years earlier in *Pro lingua latina*, Barrio had noted the Petrarch-Jacob comparison, referring to Jacob as the most saintly patriarch. Barrio explained that Petrarch had tried to liken himself to Jacob because he was a patriarch, and that Petrarch had merely changed one letter and suppressed another.[105] However, the question arises as to what divine or sacred element Barrio identified in this comparison. In order to better understand Barrio's approach, one must remember that he was a friar who most likely became a priest and was therefore familiar with theology, preaching, the sacred word and biblical exegesis to a certain degree; this knowledge may elucidate his comment.

Genesis 29 narrates the story of Jacob, the son of Isaac and Rebekha. Having been sent to relatives in Harran, Jacob serves his mother's brother Laban for seven years in order to marry Laban's daughter Rachel, but is betrayed by Laban and forced to marry Leah. After another seven years of service he is finally able to marry Rachel. On his way back to Kanaan, Jacob is attacked. At the conclusion of the fight the perpetrator reveals his identity as an angel and

103 See Appendix, doc. 1.3b/e.

104 Ibid.

105 See Barrio, *PLL*, 410.

gives Jacob a new name, Israel, explaining that Jacob had been battling with God. The meaning of his new name is uncertain but has been suggested to mean "[The God] El rules" (cf. Hos. 12:4).[106] Jacob is therefore believed to have had physical contact with God and reached a higher state of being as expressed by his new name, rendering him not only the physical but spiritual ancestor of the people of Israel.

This story has a long exegetical Catholic tradition. The *Glossa ordinaria*, used in medieval schools, interpreted Leah and Rachel as forms of the Church, and Jacob as Christ. This reading was based on the exegete belief that Jacob's love was a means to recognizing Christ's love. Petrarch apparently sought to express this as well. According to the *Glossa ordinaria*, Jacob served and loved Rachel in the same way that Christ loved his Church.[107]

Other exegeses of this episode, such as the interpretation of Pope Gregory the Great, offer a reading that is echoed in Landino's interpretation of Rachel in the *Divina Commedia*. According to Gregory, Jacob's love for Rachel signifies the *vita contemplativa*. This form of love, Pope Gregor explains, is also expressed in the *Song of Songs*. He draws an analogy between Rachel and Jacob and the bride and bridegroom, showing that they can be understood as Christ ("sponsus") and his Church ("sponsa").[108] He even explains that Jacob's love was the last of the three steps of the ladder to divine contemplation ("scala ad contemplationem dei").[109]

If any of these interpretations had been known to Barrio, he might have sensed an implicit subtext in canzone *RVF* 206 in which the poet, weaving the idea of spiritual refinement into his own spiritual development, ascribed to himself the patriarch's holy love, perhaps even Christ's love and position. This reading suggests a detection of the poet's desire for deification through profane love.[110] Barrio likewise discovers that the poet compares himself to Solomon in matters of love; he may even have sensed a certain nearness to Solomon's *Song of Songs* here. In *Pro lingua latina* he refers to the *Song of Songs*, explaining that, unlike Petrarch, Solomon does not speak of any woman "nominatim", but of the Virgin Mary or the Church, "anima sponsa" of Christ. He observes

106 See *The Jewish Study Bible*, ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 68.

107 *Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria*, introduction by Karlfried Froehlich and Margaret T. Gibson (Strassburg: A. Rusch, 1480/1, facs. edn., Turnhout: Brepols, 1992), see *Genesis* 29.

108 *Sancti Gregori Magni expositiones in Cantica canticorum, in librum primum Regum*, ed. P. Verbraken O.S.B. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963), 9 und *Glossa ordinaria*, pars 22: *In Cantico canticorum*, ed. Mary Dove (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), Prothemata, 73.

109 *Sancti Gregori Magni expositiones in Cantica canticorum*, 9.

110 Cf. *PLL*, 415-6 and Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

analogies between Petrarch's love poems and the *Song of Songs*, Petrarch and Solomon, and Laura and the bride-soul. It is, of course, unclear what Barrio found in this passage, but his comment goes beyond a purely literal reading and involves semantic structures. Barrio may well have rejected the necessity of allegorical interpretation of profane texts in general, but this does not mean that his exegetical knowledge and reading skills were not present whilst reading profane texts.

Barrio's verdict offers an approach to the study of the *Canzoniere* which was either not considered by commentators such as Vellutello or Castelvetro, or simply not recorded, for obvious reasons.[111] Barrio's censorship does not seem particularly subjective or exaggerated. It applies the doctrine of the Catholic faith as defined at the time, and it follows the Tridentine decree of 1546, which proscribed the abuse of the Sacred Scripture, referring in particular to profane contexts. Barrio's judgment shows striking analogies to the *Avertimento* on Petrarchist poetry.

The *Rime* of Bembo, Ariosto and Sannazaro are examined with a similar approach by the anonymous censor. Tracing religious language, the censor focuses on the theme of the sublimation of the lover's emotional experience and explores its spiritual meaning. One reason for this is that love does not concern morality alone, as explained in his *Avertimento* on Speroni's *Dialogo d'amore*:

> Per descriver poi ben bene gli affetti et gli effetti amorosi d'un innamorato et in presenza et in absenza della sua innamorata usa parole tanto vergognose che sarebbe troppa indecenza a raccontarle. Leggasi il dialogo a charta 13: Deh se mai vi fece Amor sentire questo suo sommo diletto etc. Et a charta 28: Ella rise, ella pianse etc. dove pone quanto sia grande l'amorosa felicità in pensare, et ricordarsi delle cose fra gli innamorati passate, quali con tutto che sieno peccati et dishonestà, egli però a ciascun passo chiama: gioie, felicità, effetti miracolosi, sommo diletto, bene del quale niuno altro è maggiore.[112]

In his view, the description of the affects and effects of love involves the faith because the faith is naturally connected to morality and, more importantly, because affects and effects are sublimated by hyperboles involving the divine. In the love lyrics of Bembo, Ariosto and Sannazaro, however, he objectively investigates the relation between the depiction of the poet's emotional experience and his sublimation, and offers lucid material on the lovers' deification. In addition, he traces intratextual relations between poems of the *canzonieri*

111 Cf. Vellutello, 104v–5r, Castelvetro, *Le Rime del Petrarca*, I, 433s (canzone 29).

112 See Appendix, doc. 1.1, cf. doc. 1.2.

or *Rime* and shows how certain themes and motifs account for one another by collating portrayals of the ladies as goddesses or goddess-like women with the feelings the lovers experience due to their love and spiritual refinement.

Among the small number of quotations from Ariosto we find the opening sonnet *Perché, Fortuna, quel ch'Amor m'ha dato*, in which the lover asks Fortune why she is depriving him of what he had experienced and received from Love, which had made him feel rich and blessed: "Di ch'esser mi credea ricco et beato" (*A R Sonetti* 1.4). The next quotation is from sonnet *A R* 5 and draws a clear picture of the relation between the lady and the lover. The lover maintains that the light of his sun ("sole") fills everything around the lady with a particular happiness. Happy ("felice"), he claims, is the star under which she was born, the chamber in which she was born,[113] the milk she drank and the breast that nourished her. Her eyes could beatify ("Beò con gli occhi il foco, l'aer, et l'acque") the elements of air, fire and water. Happy is the land that could compete with her against the heavens and India.[114]

Unlike Barrio, the anonymous censor concentrates on references to beatitude, neglecting happiness, suggesting that he considered beatitude to be a spiritual experience and was endeavoring to find the key to the correct interpretation of this poem, as well as to Ariosto's *Rime*. He does not quote single words but entire lines, and the whole quotation describes the relationship between the *donna* and lover as well as the *donna* and her environment, revealing her role in the world and her power over others.

First, the lover refers to "beatitude" using an active form of the verb *beare* ("beò"), indicating the source of the power that provoked this particular happiness. The light of her eyes represents her spirit, conceived theologically or spiritually as referring beyond her to the divine dimension: God. The lover's second description of an individual influenced by her uses a passive form of the verb *beare* ("beato"). Through the use of active and passive forms, Ariosto indicates two poles, a sender and receiver, thereby illustrating the powerful relationship between them. This constellation reminds one of the spiritual relationship between God and a contemplating soul as, for instance, in the *visio Dei*, where God and the soul connect through the divine light, the Holy Ghost. Since the censor quotes entire verses, it is likely that he identified the Catholic concept in them with the help of the references to beatitude which may have functioned as key words in his reading. In addition, as the spiritual relation between a soul and God could entail the soul's assimilation with God from the theological point of view, the censor might have considered whether

113 Translation after the commentary on sonnet *A R* 5, in *A R*, 131,

114 See Appendix, doc. 1.2b, see Segre on India as "terra solare," in *A R*.

Ariosto expresses the idea that the lover had become deified through his love for the lady.

In Bembo, passages are detected that relate love to divine grace. In sonnet *B R* 38, the poet maintains that virtue radiates from the lady, and that only those who have received the gift of her contemplation through God's grace are blessed ("beato"). This, he believes, is the compensation ("mercede") for all his fears and worries. The poet further argues that, as virtue stems from the lady, he receives support ("sostegno") from her as well, so in the subsequent lines he adds that he is only happy whilst contemplating her (*B R* 38.12):

> Che sì come virtù da lei procede
> che'l tempra, et regge, et com' è sol beato
> cui per gratia il contemplarla è dato
> ed essa è d'ogni affanno ampia mercede.
> Così 'l sostegno mio da voi ne vene (*B R* 38.5–9).

One problem encountered here is that this lover is far from understanding his emotional experience as a sin but instead perceives it as a virtue. He considers it a gift from God, perhaps in the sense of the eighth book of Augustine's *Confessiones*. According to Augustine, only God's grace was powerful enough to overcome carnal desire and enable the soul to experience a purer form of love.[115] He maintains that this gift was not received by all souls, but that he had been destined to experience this love, and therewith contemplation and happiness (cf. 38.1–4).[116] This idea is censored and quoted in the section that includes superstitious elements. Similar to Petrarch, Bembo employs a paradoxical emotional experience, comparing his happiness to that of beatified souls in heaven and his pains to those felt by souls in hell and in the Dantesque circle of Styx in canzone *B R* 72 (8–18). In another poem, the censor discovers that Amor is said to have revealed to the poet "in the space of one face" everything that could be offered in heaven. Amor is once again equated with divine love, and the poet believes that divine love could be experienced through the contemplation of the face of a woman (*B R* 8.1–4).[117]

Bembo goes even further in the *Stanze*. The censor observes the idea that profane love can bring absolute beatitude. Bembo evokes the Platonic picture of the androgyn, in whom the male and female were originally united as one before being separated into two parts, resulting in each questing after their

115 See Drecoll, 96ss and 105.

116 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2c.

117 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2c.

lost part.[118] Bembo describes the emotional effect of the reunion of the two parts and maintains that they would now reach the state of complete beatitude. This, of course, suggests, at least in the literal sense, celestial beatitude as the only form of complete beatitude being neglected:

> [Però che voi non sete cosa integra,
> nè noi, ma è ciascun del tutto il mezzo:
> Amor è quello poi, che ne rintegra,
> e lega e strigne come chiodo al mezzo;
> onde ogni parte in tanto si rallegra,
> che suoi diletti e gioie non han mezzo:]
> e s'uom durasse molto in tale stato,
> compitamente diverria beato. (*B R Stanze* 47.1–8, lines 1–6 not quoted by the censor)[119]

In Sannazaro, the quotations taken from *Sonetti e canzoni* to prove idolatrous expressions are followed by a series of references to passages where Sannazaro describes the poet's inner life. These quotations reveal more about the sense and significance of love pains and the compensation ("guiderdon") for which the poet longs. Analogies between the 'profane' love story and the story of Christ's passion are now revealed. The censor commences with two quotations to prove that the lady's beauty beatifies the poet:

> 15.2.5. Di quei begli occhi, ov'io mirando fiso
> sento, qual sia 'l piacer del paradiso (*S R* 41.77–78)

and "il mio cor beasti [, o mano]" (*S R* 44.38) before proceeding to sonnet *S R* 65, where the lover calls his emotional state of pain a "hell" from which he wishes to be released, even through death "farme morendo uscir da quest'inferno" (*S R* 65.13). In this sonnet, the lover tells of a dream in which his lady appeared to him and made him remember certain things ("cose"). He forgives her the disdain and anger she had shown towards him.[120]

Following Petrarch, Sannazaro introduces a comparison between the vision in his dream and the celestial beatific vision of the blessed souls. The lover demands heaven to make his short dream eternal; his longing is so strong that

118 Cf. Bartuschat, 'Le Triomphe de Vénus et de la poésie', 198–9.

119 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2c.

120 Ibid. doc. 1.2e.

he offers his life for it. What he experiences in his vision emerges in sonnet *S R* 67, in which he maintains:

> Che così vaga in ciel mi riconduce
> et mi fa degno de' superni scanni (*S R* 67.10–11),

and it is this very explanation that was censored. One reason for this censorship is the idea that, instead of embodying sinful desire, the woman is said to be so powerful that the poet was influenced in a positive way because she had guided him 'back' to heaven in his dream and made him worthy of one of the highest seats among the blessed souls. Like the poet in Petrarch and Ariosto, this poet ascribes supernatural power to the lady. Another reason is his portrayal of her influence in the same lines. Similar to his model Petrarch, Sannazaro has the poet liken his feelings to a spiritual rapture achievable through the contemplation of female beauty.[121]

Two more quotations follow from Sannazaro's canzone *S R* 75, possibly to provide further evidence of the poet's errors, or perhaps to reveal different facets of the topic so the poet's writing could be better understood. Both describe the experience as the simultaneous sensing of strong yet contrary feelings. One might question whether it was the paradox of contrary feelings rather than the religious imagery that attracted the censor's attention, but in any event it is significant that entire lines are quoted rather than single expressions, and that both passages refer to the paradoxical emotional experience.

In the first quotation, the poet asks what pain would be as bitter and cruel as his, proclaiming that his naked soul damned to this "living hell" trembles in the fire of love. In the second quotation, the poet explains that he has never been among the blessed souls, but that the source from which his pain originates surpasses all other joy:

> Qual pena (lasso) è sì spietata et cruda
> più nel gran pianto eterno
> via maggior non la senta l'alma stanca?
> La qual dannata in questo vivo inferno
> trema nel foco ignuda,
> . . .
> Canzon mia, mai nel cielo
> ~~non fui tr~~a' li beati spirti
> non fui; ma vo' ben dirti

121 Ibid.

> che'l fonte, ond'esce sì perpetua noia
> trapassa ogn'altra gioia . . .
> (*S R* 75.1–6, 113–117, deletion after *Avertimento*)[122]

As the censor refrains from explaining these quotations, one can only speculate on the reasons for his censorships. On the basis of his previous criticisms one can assume that he did not accept the idea that the contemplation of a mortal woman enables a mortal man to elevate his mind to divine contemplation. He rejects it in his *Avertimento sopra il Dialogo d'amore di m. Sperone Speroni* as well:

> Et benché sottogiunga che gli huomini non deono esser contenti di quella prima divinità d'Amore la quale è come anchora alle bestie che consiste nel piacer dei sensi, ma che si deve aspirar più alto a quella divinità d'Amore che è propia della ragione, nondimeno non intende per questo qualche amor buono o santo, ma solamente intende che la ragione anchora sia occupata in questo amor lascivo de gli innamorati et che s'ingegni l'huomo di pensar, di comporre et di scriver sonetti et canzoni et cose appertinenti a questo amore come chiarissimamente si raccoglie dalle sue parole a charte 30 et 31.[123]

This position would probably have been shared by Barrio, as one can infer from his judgments on Petrarch. Roughly half a century later in 1622, another censor who examined Cristoforo Bronzini's *Dialogo della dignità e della nobiltà delle donne* dealt with the same aspect. In Bronzini's dialogue, the censor assesses the thesis as incorrect ("cosa pur falsa") that there is no means by which to elevate one's mind to divine contemplation other than through the contemplation of women ("non esservi altro mezzo più alto per innalzarsi alla contemplatione della bellezza di Dio, che il riguardare le Donne").[124]

Naturally, religious elements used to depict the lover and his state of spiritual refinement also caught the anonymous censor's attention. They helped specify the core idea for which the censor searched in Sannazaro's *Sonetti e canzoni* and which he sketches in his quotations. After a series of quotations dealing with superstitious belief in the influence of stars, fate, and the pagan deities Fortune and Love, the censor provides a separate section entitled

122 Ibid.

123 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.1.

124 Cf. Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. H², 119v.

"Mescola le cose sacre con le profane."[125] One might expect the main problem in the above-mentioned quotations to be the mingling of the two spheres. What the censor understood by mingling the sacred and profane becomes clear from the censored passages. To mingle the two spheres one must reach much higher. The section contains lines in which analogies between the lover and Christ are created (*S R* 26).

Once again envisaging pain in sonnet *S R* 26, the poet metaphorizes it as wounds from which he suffers because of the lady's disdain ("sdegno"). These wounds, he explains, adorn his temples and are comparable to those which once crowned Christ, the winner of the holy cross ("vincitore del sacro legno"):

> . . . tu le mie tempie ornasti (ahi fiero pegno,
> [crudel membranza in sì lontana via!)]
> di quelle orride punte, che fer pria
> diadema al vincitor del sacro legno. (*S R* 26.5–8, cf. Matt. 27:29, Mark 15:17, John 19:12)

The poet adds that he cannot believe that this should be the compensation for his suffering and "martyrdom" ("martiri," *S R* 26.9–10). From the censor's perspective these verses may have seemed a profanation of Christ's passion and Christian martyrdom, perhaps even a perversion. If he had read these lines allegorically, he might have found that in desiring death and resurrection, the lover wished to become similar to Christ and to lead a life in Christ as described by Saint Paul. In other words, he might have recognized the idea of the lover's deification but not accepted it.

There is no mention of a syncretistic concept of love underlying Sannazaro's poems, and the idea that the lover endeavored to overcome carnal desire seems neglected. For instance, in canzone *S R* 29 the lover asks his soul to return to its sacred undertaking ("la tua sacra impresa," *S R* 29.1). Inflamed with another love and a more beautiful fire ("D'un altro amor, d'un più bel foco accesa") his soul will know a more graceful and life-giving hope ("speme più leggiadra et alma," *S R* 29.5–8). The censor makes no reference to the poet's new way ("nova arte") of thinking, reasoning with his heart ("col mio cor di voi penso e ragiono") and elevating his spirit to heaven (*S R* 78), nor does he draw attention to the poet's hope for God to guide his lost heart back to the right path (*S R* 76.5–11).

As the *Avertimento* offers no interpretation of the quoted poems, it is hard to say what the censor sought and found in them. What we can establish is that he traced analogies between the poetic love concept and the Catholic faith.

125 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.2e.

In so doing, he determined the transfer and use of fundamental ideas of the Catholic belief in salvation in a profane love story. He paid little attention to Neo-Platonic ideas which modern scholars of Petrarch and Petrarchism have often observed in this kind of poetry. Only once did he remark that Bembo had dealt with divine love in a Platonic way: "... Tratta de l'amor divino alla Platonica."[126] This observation was based on a comment on poem *B R* 82 made by Francesco Sansovino, the editor of the volume. Sansovino explains that the sonnet is about divine love as described by Plato as well as the two senses that enable a lover to perceive the divine: seeing ("vedere") and hearing ("udire"). The censor makes no mention of the two senses, only pointing to the 'way' in which divine love is treated ("alla Platonica"), thereby indicating one of the sources of Bembo's poetry and a potential influence on his thought and convictions. This, of course, was one of the censor's main interests and must therefore be acknowledged.[127]

Neo-Platonic ideas in poetry by Catholic authors raised suspicion of the authors' convictions.[128] It seems strange that the censor did not investigate Bembo's and the other poets' intentions more closely. It might have been due to the fact that the Catholic faith offered similar material and explanations for ideas while the Neo-Platonic system offered none. The poetic use of language and imagery known to the Catholic cult may also have guided the censor and made him link the poetic concept of love to the Catholic faith. His presentation of the poets' works certainly contains even more implications than shown above; they must have been so obvious to the censorial authorities that they did not feel it necessary to record and explain them. An example follows.

At the Vatican Academy Noctes Vaticanae the seven beatitudes once announced by Christ were intensely discussed during the time in which love poetry was being examined by the Roman censorial authorities. One of the lectures given by an academy member called *l'Umile* dealt with the third beatitude originating in pain ("dolor") and tears ("lagrime") as expressed in the Gospel of Matthew: "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted" (Matt. 5:4).[129] The third beatitude indicates a time of purification when mourning one's sins and errors leads to recognition. It is noteworthy that this beatitude is linked to and caused by a painful experience. Thus, the Christian faith offers a paradigm of contrary affects that has a role in man's spiritual development

126 See Appendix, doc. 1.2f.

127 Bembo, *Le rime* (Venice: Francesco Sansovino, 1561), 27v. This edition contains no printing privilege.

128 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.14b, c.

129 Cf. Valier, *Noctes Vaticanae*, 56.

similar to the pattern of paradoxical affects of love poetry. Significantly, *l'Umile* explains that such an experience of pain ("dolore") and spiritual beatitude or happiness ("felicità") was not at all popular amongst Greek and Latin philosophers, but it was typical of Christian thought. From this perspective the concept of love that the two censors found in the love lyrics originated in the Catholic faith, not Neo-Platonism. This accounts for the deep interest in the topic and why they did not go into detail about Neo-Platonic elements.

The oxymoron *sweet and bitter* (*dolce-amaro*), so popular with the Petrarchists, appears in a speech given by Carlo Borromeo. Opening his lecture on the fourth beatitude, Borromeo elaborates on the role of tears and pain in Christian thought. He includes the well-known oxymoron which, according to several critics, originated in Petrarchan poetry. He maintains that if one cries tears over one's sins whilst remembering Christ and his passion, one may receive eternal consolation in heaven. This concept includes extreme emotional experiences as well as compensation for tears and suffering, a strong analogy to the lovers' hope for spiritual reward ("guiderdon") for their love pains.

In order to clarify the difference between tears cried due to profane suffering and tears shed from the recognition of sin, Borromeo employs the antithesis of bitter and sweet. Tears of "carnal people," Borromeo states, crying over earthly things, are painful and bitter ("lagrime dolorose e pianto amaro") while tears in Christ are sweet ("lagrime dolci e pianto soave"),[130] in the same way as divinity is described as "sweet" in the Scriptures. The significance of 'good' tears lies in the recognition of having offended the Christian God ("d'aver offeso Dio") by having sinned, and in the hope for salvation. Meditation on Christ and his passion and martyrdom whilst crying is useful ("utile") and fruitful ("fruttuoso"), as one can be consoled by it.[131] This implies that sweet tears can lead to happiness unlike tears cried over profane things.

The necessity and fruitfulness of tears is also discussed by Bellarmine in his detailed study *De gemitu columbae sive de bono lachrymarum*. Basing his stance on the Old Testament, Bellarmine emphasizes the role of tears in the refinement of the heart which commences in the "valley of tears" ("valle lachrymarum, in loco, quem ipse sibi posuit") where man goes because of his sins ("merito culpae suae") and from where he can ascend by groaning ("gemitu") and shedding tears ("lachrymis") with hard work and exhaustion ("magno

130 Cf. Carlo Borromeo, in Valier, *Noctes Vaticanae*, 75.

131 Cf. 'L'Umile', in ibid., 59–61, 65–6.

labore," "fatigatione").[132] The necessity of tears is supported in the *Song of Songs*.[133]

None of the censors refers explicitly to these Catholic ideas, either because such ideas were not considered, or because they were common knowledge. Two more factors must be taken into account. It is feasible that the censors also provided an oral presentation of their judgments which may have been more detailed. This was common procedure. A written statement or its copy for which there was no fixed form was submitted afterwards. It should not be underestimated that the feelings and affects which the censors observed and studied, such as beatitude and extreme martyrdom-like suffering, were of central significance in Christian thought. Such analogies should be acknowledged and studied. The expectation of lovers that they would receive spiritual compensation for their suffering, which compelled them to continue loving and enabled them to endure pain and experience spiritual refinement, is an idea close to the Christian concept of deification. The Catholic system even offered an interpretation of the sweetness and bitterness of love.

What remains absent is the connection between medieval love poetry, mysticism and Protestantism which was again examined in the 1580s. Barrio's censorships of *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, including his judgments on *Divina Commedia*, *Orlando furioso*, *Arcadia* and *De partu Virginis*, were archived in two fascicles. Some years later two censorships of works by the fourteenth-century mystic and theologian Johannes Tauler and the sixteenth-century Calvinist Johannes Drusius were written and attached to Barrio's judgments.[134]

It is has not yet been asked why Barrio's censorships were archived together with censorships by other censors. It has not yet been asked why the first copy forms one fascicle together with a censorship of Johannes Drusius, and the second copy forms another with a censorship of Johannes Tauler. The censorships of Drusius and Tauler are also written in Latin, but in another hand. All censorships deal with similar themes, suggesting that they were archived together because of thematic analogies. Perhaps it is even worth mentioning that the same codex contains notes on St John of Damascus's writing against the Manichaeans. According to Passarelli, Barrio's documents date to the 1570s,[135] but the censorship of Tauler dates from 31 January 1585 and that of Drusius

132 Cf. Bellarmine, *De gemitu columbae sive de bono lachrymarum*, libri tres (Lyons: Horatius Cardon, 1617) 4.

133 Ibid. 12.

134 See Appendix, introduction to doc. 1.3.

135 Cf. Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*', 182; see also Appendix, introduction to doc. 1.3 and 1.4–5.

refers to a print edition published in 1584. If the documents were archived together with a particular purpose, it is likely that the documents on Drusius and Tauler were used to better understand Petrarch's work in the light of Barrio's assessment. This shows an interest in and estimation of Barrio's work as well as a particular interest in Petrarch, and, perhaps, Dante, Sannazaro and Ariosto.

The two documents on Tauler and Drusius show strong analogies to the theological and poetic themes Barrio observed in Petrarch and may add further meaning to the censorship. The document on Drusius concerns the veneration of saints with regard to superstition and idolatry and the relation between fiction and Christian history, namely the truth of the Church Fathers' teaching of Christ's Harrowing of Hell. The document on Tauler describes his idea of the union and oneness of man and God being linked to the Eucharist as well as to a form of love of God which exceeds the patience of martyrdom. Although it does not discuss Petrarch's works, it is likely that such a discussion occurred subsequently. The themes of the oneness of man and God and man's deification seem to have been of importance to the Roman Church, and appear among the ideas of Tauler's teacher Meister Eckhart, which were condemned by the Church and then defended by their author.[136] These themes also caught the attention of the Roman censors in the case of another proscribed mystic book, the *Dialogo della unione spirituale di Dio con l'anima*.[137]

Possible fields of investigation in which other vernacular poets might have been included are the imitation of Christ, especially Christ's passion, the role of the Eucharist in the spiritual development of the lover, the idea of oneness, deification and the *visio Dei*. Examining Tauler's idea of Mary as a model for the spiritual birth of God's son may also be fruitful; Mary was thought to be a model for man in whom God's Word, Christ, should be born so that the imitation of Christ could begin.

Vernacular love poetry received more attention from censors than critics have assumed. Poetry was read and examined in the light of various non-Christian and heterodox ideas and forms of belief. Since the files are incomplete, one cannot exclude the possibility that the censors consulted other sources to better understand implications regarding the faith, such as ancient ideas on love, man and God which survived to the sixteenth century.

136 Cf. Otto Karrer and Herma Piesch, *Meister Eckharts Rechtfertigungsschrift vom Jahre 1326* (Erfurt: Kurt Strenger, 1927), e.g. 76, 98, 100.

137 Cf. *ILI*; Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. H^2, 106r–107r.

5.4 Intimacy Locked Away: Trimming Literary Genres

Intimacy was a modern characteristic of medieval and early modern poetry. Was it affected by the prohibition of lascivious and obscene contents? If so, in what way was it affected, and how did this concern the literary genres which it had shaped? One perspective is seen in Speroni's account of his interrogation led by Constabile. When Constabile criticized passages of Speroni's dialogues in which thoughts were expressed that he found sinful, Speroni explained that in the dialogue genre as well as in the comedy genre various interlocutors were introduced who expressed different opinions and represented the variety found in human life.[138] Speroni suggests that Constabile criticized the description of immoral contents and the sinful side of human nature in the dialogues. It was therefore the poetic concept of the genres and their intention to depict life and human nature in its variety that posed a problem for censorship because the description of the 'bad' did not conform to Counter-Reformation values.

Speroni's efforts to defend the two genres were not very convincing at the time, as the subsequent prohibition of his dialogues shows. This was due less to the fact that the bad was described than to the way in which it was done. A side effect of Speroni's defence was that he indirectly explained to Constabile the links between the characteristics of a genre and a poet's intention to use it. If Constabile had not been familiar with the comedy and the dialogue genres prior to the interrogation, he now had information to compile a more detailed picture of the purposes and means of poetic writing. Dealing with poetry in such a way, Constabile and his socius Rossi were further able to refine their censorship strategies, as demonstrated by their use of poetic genres.

Speroni's apology sheds light on Constabile's prohibition of lyric subgenres and the love letter and its implications for them as well as literary practice in general. Constabile specifies the quality or nature of prohibited madrigals, canzoni, comedies and love letters. He refers to the content and the way the content is expressed, just as *Rule* VII mentions "lascivious or obscene things." Although these genres describe gestures, they focus on feelings and thoughts of love. The genres contain descriptions of the inner life, poetically shaped and constructed, sometimes autobiographically,[139] a hallmark embracing a variety of feelings and thoughts. If lyric poems and love letters were to be censored on the grounds of their lascivious and dishonest nature, then censorship concerned this very hallmark. It should therefore be considered in regard to the

138 See Sperone Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, in Speroni, *Opere*, 1740, i, 266s.

139 On lyric poetry as imitation or narration, see Torelli, 304–6, Minturno, 175.

detailed portrayal of affects and thoughts of such a nature. It was also about the introspection into the inner life and the way of dealing with its variety of feelings; that is to say, it concerned intimacy in poetry, its themes and a manner of writing.

Affects in poetry play an important part in Bishop Minturno's discussion of lyric poetry (here "melic poetry") even though poetological debate over the lyric genre was still in its initial phase at that time.[140] Minturno's view helps to further elucidate Constabile's prohibition. As a bishop and poet, he sought to integrate poetics into the Catholic faith and conceded a certain degree of poetic licence, but at the same time he underscored its boundaries. Minturno explains that melic poetry is the imitation of actions that could be grave and honored or pleasant and cheerful. He adds that the melic poet depicts the shape of the body ("forma del corpo"), the affects of the mind ("affetti dell'animo") and customs ("i costumi"). On the one hand, he pays much attention to the mode of expression; the poet was to design the depiction in a manner so vivid that, while reading his poem, one could truly see what it described, as in Horace's *Odes* or Petrarch's love lyrics.[141] On the other hand, not all affects of the soul were to be depicted. He lists a range of qualities in order to define those he considers appropriate. Affects, Minturno says, should be pleasant, sweet, flattering, humane, gentle, peaceful and cheerful and shaped in a moderate way. Kind and sweet feelings should be evoked by requesting forgiveness, praising, rejoicing, thanking and the like.[142] Lasciviousness and obscenity were not discussed.

Minturno subjugates melic poetry to good morals which brings him close to the position of Constabile, Di Dio, Barrio, the anonymous censor of the love poets, Bellarmine and Sirleto. He concedes considerably more freedom to vernacular poetry than the four other censors because he is more sensitive to allegorical interpretation and open to the poets' intentions. His tolerant attitude is declared in the preface to his *L'arte poetica*, but apparently Minturno also attempted to propagate it at the Council of Trent; he received harsh criticism from Barrio in his censorship of *Orlando furioso*.[143] While Barrio severely censored Petrarch's works, they played an important role in Minturno's treatise as models of lyric poetry. It is therefore no surprise that Minturno took

140 Cf. Torelli, 262. Torelli explains that Vincenzo Maggi considers lyric poetry an imperfect part ("parte imperfetta") of poetry and Robortello treats lyric poetry as "poemi piccioli", deeming it a "part of parts" ("parte delle parti").

141 Cf. Minturno, 175.

142 Ibid. 177, also 261.

143 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3h.

a stand regarding the depiction of Petrarchan love, evidently feeling compelled to defend the poet. He declared that in speaking about "love crimes" ("delitti d'amore"), Petrarch failed to deal with wicked pleasures ("a' vili piaceri dell'humil plebe").[144] Minturno must have interpreted the *Canzoniere* differently than the other censors, as he appreciated good moral purpose and accepted polysemous semantic structures as constitutive of meaning and granted poetic licence to use biblical and liturgical material.

What Minturno's approach to melic poetry shows is that he endeavored to theoretically shape a mode of expression constructively rather than through prohibition in order to make it concern the inner life in a way acceptable to contemporary Catholics. For this reason he recommended only a selection of affects and feelings for poetic description, and excluded others, restricting inner life and intimacy.

If the censorship of love lyrics controlled the expression of inner life and intimacy, the impact of this censorship must be considered more carefully. To recognize only the suppression of lascivious and obscene contents in this censorship would be to understand it superficially without implications. This censorship also concerns individuality and subjectivity. It implies the control and restriction of aspects considered to be modern in, and crucial to, late medieval and Renaissance poetry as well as autobiographical writing.

Scholars of the Renaissance have repeatedly emphasized that the 'modern times', more precisely, the culture of the Renaissance explored man, his value and place in Creation. They maintain that the early phase of Italian vernacular poetry in the thirteenth century played an important role in this discovery. According to Michael Bernsen, Giacomo da Lentini's love poetry developed self-reflexivity and "inwardness" ("Innerlichkeit"). It offered a basis for the expression of self-consciousness in poetry. In addition, as Bernsen shows, the inwardness operated in a creative manner whereby the author became a creator in concurrence with God. On this basis, the introspection into the inner life of the lover was further explored by Guido Cavalcanti.[145] It was made a key issue in Petrarch, whose *Canzoniere* has been classified as a "Bewusstseinsroman" by Paul Geyer. Petrarch's work on consciousness and the reception of his lyrics in subsequent centuries is considered important in the development of modern consciousness.[146] The discussion of inner life, intro-

144 Cf. Minturno, 185.

145 Cf. Bernsen, 248, 262 and 272.

146 Cf. Paul Geyer, 'Petrarca *Canzoniere* als Bewusstseinsroman', in id. and Kerstin Thorwarth (eds.), *Petrarca und die Herausbildung des modernen Subjekts* (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2009), 109–54 and other articles in Geyer/Thorwarth.

spection and consciousness was not restricted to affects and passions but left room for subjective and individual thought and questions concerning the faith and morality. Critics identify the "deconstruction" of early or contemporary systems of meaning ("Sinnsysteme") in Petrarch's works, which they consider "a constructive principle."[147] This principle may have become an object of imitation in Petrarchist writing. For this reason the censorship of love poetry had far-reaching implications for poetry, and was intended to reach far beyond.

Letters of various kinds had been included in Roman and local blacklists since the 1570s.[148] In 1574, for instance, letters by single authors such as Orazio Brunetto and Bandello, the entire subgenre of the love letter ("lettere amorose") as well as letters written by damned authors ("lettere scritte da authori dannati") figured in Constabile's May *Aviso*. Letter collections could be indirectly banned as part of the complete works of a banned author if they contained heterodox contents. For instance, the May *Aviso* includes the entry "Andrea Calmo, cioè tutte le sue opere," indicating that Constabile prohibited Calmo's complete works, including his *Lettere facete e chiribizzose in lengua antiga venetiana*.[149]

The *Index* of Parma of 1580 mentions an edition of love letters published by Francesco Sansovino in two books which may refer to Alvise Pasqualigo's *Lettere amorose di due nobilissimi ingegni libri due* (Venice, 1567), "Lettere facecie et piacevoli quo ad res iocosas si abutuntur sacris litteris" and an edition of *Lettere di diversi nobilissimi huomini*, Venice by Aldo Manuzio in 1567, unless corrected ("prius corrigantur"), and it repeats Constabile's general prohibition of love letters. Likewise, the *Index* of 1590 listed "Literae amatoriae sine nomine auctoris" and "Literae diversorum nobilissimorum &c. impressae Venetiis 1515. & 1516" as well as letters by Pasqualigo, Girolamo Parabosco, Orazio Brunetto, "Literae Rai iocosae" (=Rao) and Veronica Franco that needed to be corrected according to the rules. All of Pasqualigo's *Lettere amorose* and Sansovino's

147 Cf. Klaus W. Hempfer, 'Antinomie discursive a concorrenza di modelli alternative della realtà (RVF 31–40)', in *Il Canzoniere. Lettura micro e macrotestuale*, 98–114, 108–14.

148 For the blacklists see *ILI*, ix. On the genre and genesis of the familiar letter see Amedeo Quondam, 'Dal 'formulario' al 'formulario': cento anni di libri di lettere', in id. (ed.), *Le* carte messaggiere. *Retorica e modelli di comunicazione epistolare: per un indice dei libri di lettere nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1981), 13–156, 49, 111 and 29–38.

149 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 747; cf. the *Index* of Giovanni Di Dio, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XIV, *Libri volgari sospetti*, and *Ind.* XVII.3, section *Libri catholicorum expurgandi ob utilitatem publicam*: "80 Litterae quae vulgo appellantur piacevoli et burlevoli, 81 Litterae del Rao Burlesche", Simone Ragagli, ' "Né contra la religione né i buoni costumi." Alcune osservazioni su censura ecclesiastica e Lettere volgari nel secondo Cinquecento', *Rivista di Storia e letteratura Religiosa*, 1 (2005) 193–219, 203ss.

Lettere amorose in dieci libri, Calmo, Bandello, Brunetto, Rao and Franco reappear in the *Index* of 1593.[150]

As a feature of written communication, intimacy was not an invention of the Middle Ages. Critics maintain that it was rediscovered by humanists in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance and initially evolved in epistolary writing.[151] It was again Petrarch, who, by building on ancient epistolary writing of authors such as Cicero, shaped the humanist familiar letter and autobiographical writing with his letter collection *Familiarium rerum liber*.[152] Petrarch made *familiaritas*, connected by Eden to intimacy, the hallmark of his familiar letter, whose purpose he defined as making the recipient more informed about the writer's "state of mind" ("animi status"). Following Cicero, Petrarch defined the "style" ("stilus") in which the familiar letter was written as "intimate" ("familiariter") because in his view a letter was an expression of the writer's quality of mind ("mentis habitus"). A mind was individual, therefore the familiar style must be individual. The style of intimacy or, to put it in Eden's words, the rhetoric of intimacy, was therefore an "instrument of self-expression." In seeking the closeness of the reader, it was consciously designed to create a mutually intimate relationship between the writer and the reader who perceived and became familiar with the writer's intimate "feelings, character, disposition and type of mind" ("affectus, indolem, sensum, ingeniumque").[153] This close relationship could, effectively communicate ideas to the reader, possibly even seducing and manipulating him.

The Petrarchan concept shaped the sixteenth-century familiar letter, which developed as a popular and successful means of intimate, individual, and subjective self-expression and writer-reader communication. It was a natural consequence that the familiar letter contained elements that attracted the attention of the censorial authorities. As scholars of vernacular epistolography have pointed out, the idea of composing a letter for an unknown audience influenced the composition; it determined the degree to which the writer gave insight into his or her intimate sphere, and shaped and changed the thoughts and feelings about which he or she wrote.[154]

---

150 See *ILI*, ix, 832, 829, 753 and 908.

151 Cf. Kathy Eden, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), 2.

152 Cf. Karl. A.E. Enenkel, *Die Erfindung des Menschen. Die Autobiographik des frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2008).

153 Cf. Eden 53, 58–60, 67, 85s.

154 Cf. Quondam, 22, Meredith K. Ray, *Writing gender in Women's Letter Collections of the Italian Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 7, cf. Enenkel, 27–9.

Anne Jacobsen-Schutte has shown that the highly popular collection of *Lettere volgari* was even used as a vehicle of Evangelist thought. In the dedicatory letter of the first volume of *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini*, Paolo Manuzio suggests that it might contain "hidden ideas of the soul" and he makes accessible the "flowers of the [writers'] intellects for the common utility."[155] Jacobsen Schutte observed that the popular collections of *Lettere volgari* are still characterized by a frank handling of moral, political and religious ideas.[156] Simone Ragagli, however, noted a general decline in the publication of letter collections by prohibited authors and anthologies after 1559, blaming it on censorship. Only love and burlesque letters prevailed.[157]

This is not to say that the concept of the familiar letter, its intimacy and individuality, was consciously taken into account by censors. It was by aiming to suppress certain contents that censorship indirectly entailed the manipulation of the familiar letter. One letter genre that was particularly affected by such politics was the love letter ("lettere amorose"). As intimate affection and thoughts of carnal love were usually at the center of this genre, the entire genre was prohibited by Constabile's May *Aviso* of 1574. Unlike the prohibition of lyric subgenres, the prohibition was not restricted to love letters of a certain quality or nature; it was comprehensive. Constabile indicated that there were different sorts of love letters, all of which were proscribed: "Lettere amorose di nessuna sorte, non si permettono, così anchora quelle scritte da Auttori dannati." This prohibition was pronounced by the local Inquisitions of Modena: "Lettere amorose di qualonque sorte, et di qualonque Autore" (*Lista de libri prohibiti mandata da Roma 15 Augusti 1577*) and Vercelli: "love letters of any kind" ("lettere amorose di nissuna sorte").[158]

Other collections of love letters were classed as "suspect" in Di Dio's *Index* of 1576, which offers insight into the assessment of love letters by the Roman censorial authorities. Section *L*, *Libri volgari sospetti*, lists "Lettere amorose di m. Luigi Pasqualigo, stampato in Venetia nel 1579 (= 1570)" and "Lettere del Parabosco" which were assigned to the second class of the *Index* with "Lettere amorose in dieci (= nove) libri, le quali apportano grandissimo danno alla Christianità."[159] The indicated works deal extensively with the theme of love

155 Cf. Anne Jacobsen Schutte, 'The *Lettere Volgari* and the Crisis of Evangelism in Italy', *Renaissance Quarterly* XXVIII (1975), 639–88, 653–4.

156 Cf. Anne Jacobsen Schutte, 659s and 673.

157 Cf. Ragagli, 202–3.

158 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 747, 755 and 757.

159 Cf. Vatican, ACDF, Index XIV, under *L Libri volgari sospetti*. Cf. Alvise Pasqualigo's *Delle lettere amorose di due nobilissimi intelletti libri due. Ne' quali leggendosi una historia*

and are colored by Petrachist elements. Listed as suspect books, they had been recommended for examination and, given the negative assessment of Petrarchist lyrics, they certainly contributed to the prohibition of the love letter genre.

Aside from the fact that love letters concerned morality and faith, Di Dio's *Index*, Constabile's general prohibitions and the local blacklists suggest that, as in the case of madrigals and canzoni, the censorial authorities had become aware of the increasing number of printed love letters. They may have also understood that, as an instrument of control, the *Index* was not powerful enough to restrict this development. The love letter enjoyed particular popularity between 1564 and 1588.[160]

The files of the Congregation for the Index do not reveal much about assessments of love letters. Small wonder, because love letters were usually repudiated on the grounds that they were love letters and due to the nature of the love described. One example is a document on *Lettere volgari, Annotata super vulgares litteras*, in which love letters by Annibale Caro and Boccaccio, published in a 1551 edition of *Lettere volgari*, were censored. The entries in the first volume read: "Carte 85 et 86: Annibale Caro. Due lettere d'amore lascive" and "Carta 105: Boccaccio. Una lettera d'amore lasciva." It is worth mentioning that Boccaccio's letter to Fiammetta was also in the prohibited love letter collection published by Sansovino. There is only one entry in the second volume: "Car. 69. Marc'Antonio Bendidio. Una lettera amorosa."[161]

A similar proceeding can be found in a fascicle with censorships prepared at the Inquisition of Perugia. This fascicle contains a censorship of *Lettere volgari di diversi autori, et nobilissimi huomini* and recommends the suppression of the love letters by Caro and others who are not identified, the letters by Pietro Aretino, whose entire works were already condemned, and, like the anonymous *Annotata super vulgares litteras*, Boccaccio's "letters" to Fiammetta:

---

continuata d'un amor fervente di molti anni tra due fedelissimi amanti, si contien ciò che può avvenire a qualunque persona questa materia, first published in Venice by Rampazetto in 1563 and in 1570 by Sansovino, and his *Delle lettere amorose libri quattro nei quali sotto meravigliosi concetti si contengono tutti gli accidenti d'amore* published in Venice by Egidio Regazzola and Domenico Cavalcalupo compagni in 1570. For Parabosco cf. his *Lettere amorose* in four books, the first of which was published in Venice by Giolito in 1545.

160 Cf. Quondam, 'Dal "formulario" al "formulario" ', 49, 111 and 29–38.

161 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.11b. On another censorship of a love letter by Caro, see the volume of *Lettere volgari* of 1567, cf. Ragagli, 203.

> Censura sopra le lettere volgari:
> Si levino le lettere amorose di Annibale Caro, et altri.
> Tutte le Pistole di Pietro Aretino.
> Tutte quelle del Boccaccio alla Fiammetta.[162]

The Perugian document suggests instructions for an expurgation of Francesco Sansovino's *Il Secretario overo Formolario delle lettere missive* (Venice: Appresso Cornelio Arrivabene, 1584). *Il Secretario* was a manual for letter writing and describes several types of letters, including two types of love letters, the lascivious and the honest ("lettera amatoria lasciva," "lettera amatoria honesta"). Both types were censored due to their contents. The judgment recommends that lascivious descriptions should be suppressed as well as parts of the honest love letter to a friend and an example of the lascivious love letter to Madonna Lucia de gli Orci:

> Censure del Formolario delle lettere Missive di m Francesco Sansovino:
> Amor lascivo carta 33 usque lamentar diremo.
> Lettera amatoria lasciva, a Madonna Lucia Orzi.
> Non senza cagione, o bellissima giovane, carta 90, dele' usque lamentare.
> A carta 48 Nella lettera amatoria honesta scritta all'amico nostro et la seconda amorosa, usque lamento.
> Carta 76 nella lettera amorosa, perché la honestà si divide usque lamentono.[163]

In the case of the love letter, the censorial procedure appears simple. The form of love described in the letters was defined, along with the linguistic and stylistic way in which it was expressed, and a judgment was made. If the love could be defined as 'lascivious,' expurgation or the prohibition of the letter was recommended.

What made love letter collections, in the eyes of censorial authorities, even more dangerous to the readership becomes clear in Sansovino's nine-volume collection, which contains love letters by various authors. Not only does Sansovino consciously ignore *Rule* VII of the *Index* of 1564 by publishing texts with lascivious content, he also claims to have important motives for this

162 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.7l.

163 Ibid., doc. 1.7f, cf. Francesco Sansovino, *Del secretario, libri VII, nel quale si mostra et insegna il modo di scriver lettere acconciamente e con arte, in qual si voglia soggetto* (Venice: Matteo Valentini, 1608).

publication. Like other letter collections, this one was supposed to serve the common good and was meant for the consolation of the readers. Sansovino proclaims that the letters are of excellent quality and authored by the most ingenuous writers famous for their refined language, but whose letters are no longer printed.[164] The authors referred to are Annibal Caro, Fortunio Spira, Francesco Landino, Giovanni Boccaccio, Giulio Camillo, Giovanni Guidiccione, Pietro Bembo and others who remain anonymous ("et altri incerti"). The focus of this collection is the display of "affetti amorosi." The primary concern was to give insight into the intimate communication of lovers which could be artificially constructed and shaped.

Sansovino included letters by Bembo because they are full of sighs ("piene di sospiri") and vague conceits ("concetti vaghi"). He chose Boccaccio's texts from the *Decamerone* because they are very vague but somewhat affected ("assai vaghe, ma alquanto affettate"). Annibale Caro is introduced as a writer widely respected in the field in terms of his manner of writing ("in questa maniera di scrivere").[165] Sansovino suggests that by 1591 the love letter was already accepted as a form of writing, a style or even as a type of epistolary subgenre. He endeavors to point out the utility of this collection in other fields of life. He expected it to serve as a rhetorical model of communication in political and business matters, and, in regard to dialogues on love by Speroni and Leone Ebreo, to inspire readers to study philosophy, or to reach for honor and virtue.[166]

The idea of a collection of style models was not new.[167] Sansovino did not only resist *Rule* VII by publishing prohibited material, he published it so that it would be imitated, proffering, from the censorial standpoint, an invitation to imitate sinful writing. Aside from the material itself, this might have been a reason why Di Dio procured an anonymous edition that he assigned to the third class of anonymous books. This edition makes no mention of a printing privilege. Perusing the pages one notes that, although the authors' names are mentioned in the introduction, most letters are anonymous ("d'incerto autore"). Some authors may have insisted on anonymity due to their social status, censorship or both. Names were suppressed even within the letters, substituted by lines or dots. In the same way certain ideas or expressions were suppressed.

164 Cf. the frontispiece of Sansovino's edition. Id., *Delle lettere amorose di diversi huomini illustri, libri nove* (n.p., n.d.).

165 Cf. Sansovino, VIIv. Cf. the frontispiece of Sansovino's edition.

166 Ibid. VIIIv–IXr.

167 Cf. Quondam, 41.

Sansovino's volume is another piece of evidence that censorship politics were not as successful as the Roman Church may have wished them to be.[168] Such letters were not consigned to oblivion; instead, as we learn from Sansovino, the love letter persisted and developed as an entire subgenre despite censorship politics. The significance ascribed to the letter collection by Sansovino as well as to Constabile's general prohibition of love letters raises the question of what such a poetic development might have brought about without ecclesiastical restrictions.

Another letter genre did not escape Di Dio's watchful eye: the epistolary novel of love (*romanzo epistolare d'amore*).[169] Among the suspect letter collections, he lists "Lettere del Parabosco" and "Lettere amorose di m. Luigi Pasqualigo, stampato in Venetia nel 1579 (= 1570)." In the epistolary novel, letters were put together to form an entire love story that could be traced through the letter exchange between lovers.[170] The first evidence of such a project on the Apennine peninsula has been identified in Parabosco's love letter collection, in which, according to Quondam, portions of a love story are described with the help of Petrarchist repertoire. Alvise Pasqualigo's letter collection is considered to be the first to have an entire story ("historia") with characters, and thus goes a step further than Parabosco's.[171] It announces its project in the title. Quondam has pointed out that the first three editions of Pasqualigo's letter romance appeared without the name of the author, and he refers to signs of self-censorship whereby proper names and other distinguishing elements are suppressed.[172]

That imitation became a challenge to Petrarchist writers is plain from the above examples of the censorship of Petrarchist poetry as well as Sansovino's love letter collection. This is a natural consequence of the *Index*, as the purpose of writing was an aspect of censorship and expressed in *Rule* VII of the *Index* of 1564. The imitation of a model implied the intention of dealing with the model. The Roman Church expected book publication and printing to serve God, have purpose and offer vivid examples of Catholic faith, virtue and learning. This expectation led the anonymous censor of Speroni's *Dialogo d'amore* to begin his judgment with the polemical remark that Speroni should have spent his time on something more worthy of a pious soul and a Christian man. He

168 Cf. Sansovino, VIIv.

169 Cf. Quondam, 97.

170 Ibid.

171 Ibid. 89–101.

172 Ibid. 101–2.

declared that Speroni could receive severe punishment from God for a work such as the *Dialogo d'amore*.[173]

The Roman Church's expectations of writing were sometimes compatible with widespread concepts of love poetry or other writing concerning love. Several publications claimed to pursue a didactic goal because they depicted lascivious love and its consequences in order to warn readers and to teach them the spiritual path to divine love. A similar intention is formulated by Pomponio Torelli in his *Trattato della poesia lirica* published in 1590. Torelli maintains that by dealing with lascivious love, lyric poetry depicts passion and lascivious gestures in order to purge the reader's soul from such passion. Like Minturno, he defends Petrarch, though he argues that Petrarch's purpose ("fine") had been to "scacciar dagli animi nostri l'eccesso di questa passion amorosa ch'è l'amor lascivo con l'imitazione delle sue passioni."[174] The crux of the matter lay in how this didactic purpose was realized in poetry. In the censors' view the kind of love poetry discussed in the 1570s concentrated too much on the display of sins and too little on the conversion to God. This point is made clear in the *Avertimento* on the three Petrarchists as well as in Barrio's censorship of Petrarch, and it helps to shed light on the prohibitions of lyric and letter genres.

In Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, the lover explains in the opening sonnet *RVF* 1 that he will tell the story of his sinful love. To a censor, such an announcement makes it instantly clear that the lover-poet is centering his sins as the main subject matter of his story. In sonnet *RVF* 93, the lover explains that Amor told him to write about his love. While the purpose of exposing his sins to the reader at Amor's command inspired generations of Petrarchists, it provoked severe criticism from Barrio, who sensed danger for young people and women. The lover's statement caused Barrio to assume that the historical person Petrarch chose this topic in order to immortalize himself through his poetic writing like a second god of carnal love. For this reason, Barrio assessed Petrarch as a criminal author ("scelestus auctor").[175] It becomes evident why Barrio, fully aware of the role of Petrarch's lyrics as a model for other authors, accused him of having produced "a lethal illness" that spread among his imitators.[176]

What is more, Petrarch's claim that another force named Amor made him write brings to mind the idea of authorship underlying Counter-Reformation censorship as discussed above in Chapter 1. A demonic force tempted authors

173 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.1.

174 Cf. Torelli, 259, 263–5.

175 See Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

176 Cf. Barrio, *PLL*, 398.

and made them write sinful or even heretical texts, which is why poets were considered the instrument of the devil by some Catholics. One could thus consider the following pattern of thought: If the Petrarchan protagonist admitted that Amor had urged him to write, if the censors understood Amor to be an allegory for the poet's sinful love, and if, in their view, sin originated in Satan, then the poet had admitted to having surrendered to Satan's temptations. Petrarch's poem addresses a concept of authorship that can be traced throughout Counter-Reformation censorship documents and which remained valid three hundred years after Petrarch.

Other implications concerning poetic introspection are linked to the performance of the author. Every poet who wished to make introspection a subject of his writing and to legally publish his work was compelled to respect censorship rules. This implies that the author had to reflect upon and model his or her writing to conform to Counter-Reformation ideals and values. This implies conscious shaping, and perhaps forging, of introspection and autobiographical elements, perhaps even the complete invention of an artificial image of inner life, thoughts and convictions. It is therefore no surprise that Petrarch's modernity had only a limited effect on his imitators who were often not able to achieve the sensual depth of their model and merely concentrated on linguistic and stylistic forms. These poets may have understood that the revelation of the depths of the conscience was a risky undertaking.

CHAPTER 6

Censoring Laughter

That Counter-Reformation censorship proceeded with rigor to suppress mockery and criticism of the 'neighbor', that is, the Christian 'neighbor', in poetry is no secret. Often such measures concerned texts in which the clergy and the religious were targeted, and sometimes texts that harmed the laity. A large number of texts in the vernacular and Latin were prohibited, suspended until they were corrected or severely expurgated. Among the literary texts concerned were works by the Three Crowns, Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, sonnets of Petrarch in Vergerio's *Alcuni importanti luoghi tradotti fuor delle epistole latine* and Dante's *Divina Commedia* as well as Niccolò Franco's *Delle Rime contro Pietro Aretino*, novelle, satires, and books on poetics and language such as Lodovico Castelvetro's *Poetica d'Aristotele* and Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare sopra il Boccaccio*.[1]

When Constabile published new lists in the 1570s, he included several authors and titles that up until then had not figured *nominatim* in the *Index*. Among them were even more texts pertaining to the novella and satire genres and burlesque poetry, all of which were deemed immoral. In Constabile's May *Aviso* of 1574 we find *Facetiae* by Arlotto Mainardi (1580/90/93), novelle such as Girolamo Parabosco's *I Diporti*, *Il Pecorone* by Giovanni Fiorentino, the 1573 *rassettatura* of the *Decamerone*, Giovan Francesco Straparola's *Notti piacevoli* and Burchiello's *Rime e sonetti*. Another list compiled by Constabile, dated the same year, includes Ariosto's *Satire*.[2] Two other lists, probably dating back to 1580, refer to a volume containing satires by Ariosto and other unnamed authors: *Nota de libri prohibiti et d'alcuni sospesi, fin che di loro venghi fatta nuova espurgatione dalla Santissima Inquisitione universale. Oltra quelli che sono contenuti nell'Indice generale fatto già per ordine et decreto del sacro Concilio di Trento* (according to *ILI*, ix c. 1580) and *Annotatio librorum prohibitorum, et eorum qui suspensi fuerunt usque ad novam expurgationem Santissime Inquisitionis preter eos qui continentur in Indice Generali edicto sacri Concilii Tridentini decreto*. A Roman list of prohibited books sent to the Inquisition of Modena dated 15 August 1577 also names Francesco Sansovino's *Cento novelle* and other authors of novelle, some of which are mentioned in internal black-

1 Cf. *Indexes* of 1558/59–1596, in *ILI*, viii–ix.

2 Cf. *Ex Vercellis. Libri parte sospesi fin a novo aviso dalla S. Romana et universal Inquisitione, & parte del tutto prohibiti* [signed by Constabile, dated 22 May 1574], in *ILI*, ix, 756–7.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_007

lists of the Congregation or in later official Roman *Indexes*, such as Bandello, Giovanni Sabadino degli Arienti and Agnolo Firenzuola.[3]

As the general laws of the *Index* suggest and internal lists of the Congregation for the Index confirm, many more texts of various genres were concerned than the official and published *Indexes* reveal. The Roman censorial authorities made use of poetic genres in order to define prohibited works. The first Roman *Index* of 1557, which was not promulgated, lists a considerable number of *pasquinades* and a general prohibition of the genre. As explained above, this prohibition concerns all writing ("Pasquilli, seu conscriptiones omnes . . .") in which God, the saints, the sacraments, the Catholic Church, its cult or the Holy See are "detracted" ("detrahatur").

It is no wonder that the landscape of vernacular poetry, especially the novella genre, changed considerably after the promulgation of the first Roman *Index* in 1558/59. Books were suppressed, expurgated or published in foreign countries. A purged anthology of Bandello's novelle was published by Ascanio Centorio degli Ortensi at Milan in 1560. The fourth part of Bandello's *Novelle* was published posthumously in Lyons in 1573. It is no secret that censorship influenced the creative process of contemporary authors. Giraldo Cinzio proposed a 'reformed' poetic theory of the novella in his 1565 *Ecatommithi*, followed by Sebastiano Erizzo's *Sei Giornate* in 1567, *Novelle* of Ascanio de' Mori da Ceno in 1585 and *Duecento novelle* of Celio Malespini in 1609. The first expurgated version of the *Decamerone* was prepared by Tomas Manriquez, master of the sacred palace in Rome, in collaboration with some philologists from Florence.[4] It was released in 1573 (Florence: Filippo and Jacopo Giunti), but immediately prohibited by Constabile. A second version was prepared by Lionardo Salviati (Venice: Giunti, 1582), and a third by Luigi Groto detto il Cieco (Venice: Fabio and Agostino Zoppini and Onofrio Farri, 1588). Eventually, Francesco Dionigi produced the *Decameron spirituale* in 1594 and dedicated it to his patron Girolamo Cardinal Rusticucci, who, significantly, had tight connections to radical members of the Roman censorship authorities, was appointed Cardinal Vicar of Rome by Sixtus V and served as Camerlengo under Clement VIII.[5]

Critics have observed that, in expurgating texts from defamatory utterances targeting the clergy and religious, Counter-Reformation censorship neglected ("trascurare") immorality such as contents of an erotic and obscene nature,[6] as

3 Ibid. 750–1.

4 See Chiecchi and Troisio, 30 at n. 7.

5 Ibid. 10s.

6 Raul Mordenti, 'Le due censure: la collazione dei testi del *Decameron* "rassettati"', 261s, Nicola Longo, 'Fenomeni di censura nella letteratura italiana del Cinquecento', ibid. 275–84, 282ss.

well as pejorative criticism and the mocking of laypeople. It has been noticed that characters of religious life as well as elements relating to the Catholic cult were censored even when they were not depicted in a negative light.[7] It has also been observed that an expurgation method frequently applied was the substitution of characters pertaining to the clergy and the religious by laypeople. Instructions given to the Florentine censors of *Decamerone* in the early 1570s by the master of the sacred palace are direct and clear:

> Terzo. Che per niun modo si parli in male o scandalo de' preti, frati, abati, abadesse, monaci, monache, piovani, proposti, vescovi o altre cose sacre, ma si mutin li nomi o si faccia per altro modo che parrà meglio.[8]

Nicola Longo has referred to this method as a "lay" or "profane mask" ("maschera laica" or "profana").[9] Mordenti explains this kind of censorship as resulting from a general attitude of Counter-Reformation censorship, and evokes the image of a somewhat arbitrary instrument regulated by subjective interest of a political authority rather than by a legal system.[10] What has not been asked or analyzed is why censors proceeded in this way and how they determined the degree of sinfulness.

To begin with, it might be helpful to observe that the idea of proceeding against criticism of the clergy and the religious did not stem from the Counter-Reformation Roman Church. The Church followed tradition and canon law. The Fifth Lateran Council issued the decree on universal pre-censorship *Inter sollicitudines* of 1515 in order to suppress texts that injured the reputations of members of the ecclesiastical and political hierarchy.[11] Yet, it was unnecessary for the Council to issue a new prohibition of defamatory utterances in this decree because the Roman Church had already taken measures against defamatory books.

The German Jesuit Jakob Gretser provided material that illustrates that, since antiquity, the emperors of the Roman Empire had taken measures against books that unjustly violated the good name of the "neighbor" ("proximi

---

7 Cf. Sberlati, 'La pia ecdotica. L'edizione censurata degli *Inferni* di Anton Francesco Doni', *Lettere italiane*, 49/1 (1997), 3–39.

8 Cf. Chiecchi, *Dolcemente dissimulando*: *cartelle Laurenziane e* Decameron *censurato* (*1573*) (Padua: Antenore, 1992), 4.

9 See Longo, 282.

10 See Mordenti, 261.

11 Cf. *Inter sollicitudines*.

famam iniuste lacerant").[12] Mockery and verbal humiliation of the neighbor were considered sins of the tongue ("peccata oris") that, according to the Gospel of Matthew (Matt. 15:18–19), originated in the heart. If true faults were told with the purpose of injuring another person, this could be assessed as detraction ("detractio"), which by nature was generally understood to be a mortal sin. The judgment depended on the subject matter of the detraction, and could be assessed as being less harmful, only a venial sin or comparable to murder ("Omnis qui detrahit fratri suo homicida est et omnis homicida non habet partem in regno Dei.").[13] Detraction was understood to be opposed to calumny, which meant that the accusation against the neighbor was based on lies. It seems plausible that the censorship of the Catholic Reformation and the Counter-Reformation was built upon tradition, but this aspect, as well as the responsibility and obligation of Roman censorial authorities to deal with the past and include tradition in their censorship policy and practice, are not addressed in studies on censorship of poetry.

During the revision of the *Index* of 1564 under Sixtus V, the apostolic protonotary Galesini, also a historian, chronicler and friend of Carlo Borromeo, spoke to the Congregation for the Index about the suppression of defamatory books. He explained that in the Roman Republic, scathing books ("libri mordaces") were once burned, and their suppression was appropriate for the "Christian republic." His examples were satires and other books which he found to be full of detractions such as the prohibited invective of Lodovico Castelvetro against Annibale Caro's panegyric *Ode Venite all'ombra de' gran Gigli d'oro*.[14] Galesini suggested that the prohibition of scathing books should be expressed in *Rule* VII, the law concerning obscene books.

This remark is quite revealing because critics understand *Rule* VII to be directed primarily against immorality of an erotic nature. As shown above, the meaning of *obscoenus* goes beyond the erotic to encompass immorality in a broader, ethical sense.[15] Galesini may have felt that it was the right place to express a prohibition of defamatory texts. In explaining the prohibition of books containing lascivious or obscene passages, *Rule* VII refers to the need

12 Cf. Gretser, I, XX.

13 See *DG*, C. 6, q. 1, c. 16.

14 Cf. *Galesini De sequentibus et ultimis regulis*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 372–5v, 373r.

15 Cf. the entry 'obscoenitas', in *Romanae Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*, iussu Instituti Savignani compertum (Berolini: Reimeri, 1939): "si servi exponant obscenitatem, in qua eos compulerint domini." or *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*, ed. H. Georges (13th edn., Hanover: Hahn, 1972).

to protect the faith and good morals.[16] This is the key to this law, and censorship of verbal obscenity was seen in the context of Counter-Reformation faith and morality.

Other laws such as the Sistine *Rules* referred to above that Galesini had a hand in preparing, as well as the Clementine *Instructions*, discuss defamatory writings in the context of good morals and Christian discipline, in the same manner as censors. Barrio begins his censorship of Dante's *Divina Commedia* with the general comment that Dante wrote things that contravened Catholic morality and religion, but his censorship makes no mention of erotic or pornographic content. By contrast, one of the main issues at stake in this censorship was the detraction ("detractio") of the clergy and the religious.[17]

The privileged treatment of the clergy, religious and secular rulers in censorship can be explained. In medieval canon law we find clauses that confirm a spiritual hierarchy in the context of the neighbor's vexation and accusation. The religious and priests rank higher than the laity and were not to be accused or judged by them. It is also explained that whoever accuses or condemns ("dampnare") priests insults God's order. Priests were to be obeyed and feared, not detracted.[18] Cardinal Valier, in his *De rhetorica ecclesiastica*, emphasizes the importance of this hierarchy and maintains that it should be respected. He compares the entire Church to a body made up of different sorts of people ("varia genera hominum") subdivided into *gradus*; the noblest limbs of the Church's body were the priests.[19]

This hierarchy can be identified in the general prohibition of *pasquinades*. It is evident in the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum*, which provides instructions and mentions texts that target the neighbor's reputation. It emphasizes the protection of church people and princes with the word "especially" ("praesertim"): "quae famae proximorum et praesertim ecclesiasticorum et Principum detrahunt bonisque moribus et Christianae disciplinae sunt contraria expungantur." It adds that all examples that injure or violate ecclesiastical rites, orders, or the status and dignity of the religious should be deleted. Only then does the *Instructio* address *facetiae* and other *dicteria* that damage the good name of the neighbor.[20]

16 See *Index* of 1564, in *ILI*, viii.

17 See Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

18 See *DG*, secunda pars, C. 6, q. 1, c. 5, 8, 9 and 12.

19 See Valier, *De rhetorica ecclesiastica*, 128s.

20 *ILI*, ix, 927.

6.1 Sensitivity of Verbal Expression

Sensitivity of verbal expression and communication were needed to assess texts containing statements about others. Such sensitivity can be traced in the *Index*, in censorships and in supplementary instructions for printing and expurgation.[21] The files of the Congregation for the Index contain drafts of these instructions that were more precise and informative than the previous *Rules* of the *Index* of 1564. They are particularly interesting from a philological standpoint because they offer a glimpse into the sensitivity of verbal expression and other aspects of a philological nature. Under Sixtus V, additional *Rules* were prepared for the printing of books. *Rule* III mentions expressions and modes of speaking against the faith, good morals and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. A classification of words and sentences is provided. Expressions that could be classified as salty, witty, satirical, detracting, ludicrous or obscene were not to be tolerated.

> *Rule* III:
> Tollantur ex libris imprimendis quaeque recentes, et subtiliores opiniones dissidiis, concitandis potius apta, quam fovenda pietati, Phrases etiam et quicunque loquendi modi, qui sanctae fidei, bonis moribus, Ecclesiasticaeque iurisdictioni adversantur, et obesse possunt, item verba salsa, satyrica, detractoria, ludicra, obscaena, et reliqua huiusmodi, quibus assertationes nimia, et impudentes adduntur.[22]

Forms of verbal expression were associated with literary genres or subgenres. A few were singled out in the *Rules* due to particular modes of speaking, negativity or intentions. *Rule* IV prohibits invectives and apologies that disparage or "detract" a neighbor's reputation as well as abusive writing such as that found in satires and comedies that disturbs Christian discipline or propagates vices and bad customs. Such texts affected not only the dignity and reputation of the neighbor but were to be understood and applied in a wider sense of Catholic discipline and morality.

---

21 See *Sixti Quinti Pontificis Maximi Regula adiecta ad imprimendorum librorum usum*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVII.1, n. p., *Sixti Pontificis Regula imprimendi libros*, Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 12v–3r and 222r–3r, and *Sixti Quinti Pontificis Maximi Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 11r–12r (see the reproduction of the latter in the Appendix, doc. 2.1).

22 See *Sixti Quinti Pontificis Maximi Regula adiecta ad imprimendorum librorum usum*.

> *Rule* IV:
> Prohibentur etiam imprimi Invectivae, Apologiae omnes, quibus alienae famae detrahitur, maledicique libri et eiusdem generis satyrae, comediae, et scripta quaecunque quibus Christiana disciplina perturbatur vel vitiorum seminaria improbique mores propagantur.[23]

The Sistine *Index* appeared in 1590 and was abrogated after the pope's death. It includes a corpus of general prohibitions which replaced the one found in the *Index* of 1564. It is more severe than the earlier version but also more precise in that it mentions poetic genres, epigrams, elegies, emblems, satires and poems that contravene honesty, morality or a ruler's good reputation. Suppressing such books was meant to protect good morals ("boni mores") and honesty ("honestas").

> *Rule* XIII:
> Epigrammata, Elegiae, Emblemata, Satyrae, et Poemata quaecunque honestati, bonis moribus aut Principum famae adversantia quocunque idiomate et quavis ratione etiam exercendi ingenii causa fiant, omnino interdicuntur.[24]

This conscious use of language was already evident in the previous *Indexes* which sought to define heterodox and prohibited materials. The previous *Indexes*, however, had not been as detailed in their descriptions. Following measures and ideas of Sistine censorship politics, the Clementine *Instructio* offers an overview of various classifications of words, sentences and other forms of expression in order to define contents worthy of correction.

Before going through examples of censorship, I would like to draw attention to Bishop Minturno's treatise *L'arte poetica* because it describes the connection between verbal expression and its effects, dealing quite extensively with satire, *motti* and laughter at others. Minturno seeks to explain the satiric poet's duty ("officium") and aim ("fine") of using satire and what a satiric poet should avoid. First, Minturno understands satire to be a kind of medicine for the soul:

> Come adunque le informità e le ferite del corpo direste esser materia della Medicina come quella che in loro si rivolta: così le passioni e le piaghe dell'animo soggetto di questa satirica poesia chiamereste. E perciocché l'una e l'altra ha per suo fine la sanità, quella del corpo, questa

23 Ibid.

24 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 797.

> dell'anima, similmente ha cura di sanare quella con le cose, questa con le parole, quella con amara bevenda, questa con acerba riprensione.[25]

Satiric poets were not to treat subjects pertaining to philosophy but were to focus rather on virtues and their contravention. Satire, Minturno explains, is an imitation of a vicious and reprehensible matter which uses naked and pure verse and simple expressions. It is acute in order to amend life in a universal rather than in a singular way. Minturno explains that it is best to serve medicine with a sweet dressing to hide its bitter taste. A poet should prepare his listener's soul; his "stings" ("puncture") should be flavored with pleasantness so that its pungency would only be felt when perceived in the mind, otherwise the satire would increase rather than cure vices. Horace is introduced as a model poet who had opted to reprimand in a sly way, demonstrating that such reprimanding was actually a good friend's duty.[26]

The questions of what could be subject to laughter ("ridere") and jest ("motteggiare"), how laughter could be provoked, and what should be respected are addressed in connection with the comedy genre. Far from understanding laughter as an obscene loss of control and a monk's enemy, he explains that joy ("festevolezza") originates in nature, and naturally belongs to man. He considers laughter and jest to be divine gifts that could be enhanced through art.[27] In his view divine gifts, human nature and poetry should work together, and he enumerates seven methods of provoking laughter,

The first method is to point out vices of a mind ("vitii dell'animo") and physical defects. One may laugh at the stupid, the vain, monstrous servants ("mostruosi servi") or deformed elderly women. One should, however, respect good morals and not describe dishonest deeds, swear or express detraction. The second method is imitation; one may depict an ugly face or a lame foot. The third manner is similarity, such as when a character disguises himself and pretends to be someone else as Cherea pretends to be the eunuch in Terence's comedy. The fourth method is expressing one's contempt through mimicry, sticking out one's tongue, stammering or laughing derisively. The fifth method is to use dishonest actions and words; Minturno recommends avoiding this method as he feels it goes against good morals. The sixth method is to use offensive words, but only for servants, *ruffiano* and *parasito*. Finally, the seventh method is servile and peasant affability as found in the language of

25 Minturno, 272.

26 Ibid. 272s.

27 Ibid. 131.

servants.[28] Minturno understands laughter as a didactic means of teaching right from wrong by demonstrating bad examples. He makes no mention of the clergy or the religious because they were not to be exposed to criticism, even for didactic and moral purposes.

Minturno considers the mode in which such criticism should be expressed an essential aspect of designing humorous or ridiculous scenes. He underlines that ugliness ("brutezza") should be the material of jest to inspire marvel in the reader, yet the poet must find an adequate manner in which to represent the material. The best way of doing so is to treat it "prettily" ("leggiadramente") without giving offence.[29] Minturno's poetological position was determined by his ethic views influenced by his faith. The combination of poetics and ethics is not new, of course. It instantly recalls Aristotle and the Horatian dictum *delectare et prodesse* and can be found in early sixteenth-century poetics. Minturno was involved in the reform of the Paulinian *Index* at the Council of Trent and one should take into consideration that Counter-Reformation ideas of poetry may have influenced his treatise. If this was the case, his *L'arte poetica* may be understood as an attempt to introduce Counter-Reformation ideas into poetics and poetic creation in a positive way in order to influence through teaching and demonstrate the limits of poetry by using its own language.

By contrast, expurgated books often give the impression that censors were anything but sensitive to language and that criticisms of the clergy and the religious were censored without considering the consequences of the suppression. This may be true to a certain degree, especially where the result of an expurgation is a text that does not seem to make sense. A process that lay between the detection of a disparaging utterance and its suppression that is still in need of attention is the examination of the utterance. As in other cases of censorship, examining this process helps to better understand the final outcome. Documents of the Congregation for the Index reveal that censors tried to grasp the author's intention and estimate the damage an utterance could cause the targeted person or institution. Again, it was the word that counted: in a wider sense, language. As language was used in the *Index* to define prohibited texts, censors made use of it. They used the language of the examined author as an instrument or tool to understand the meaning of his text, and they consciously used language to convey and explain their interpretation of the work and verdict. Their competency in this field, however, is another question.

28 Ibid. 132–4.

29 Cf. Minturno, 131ss, also Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

One example is Barrio's approach to the assessment of text. As shown above, he distinguished between different forms of speech in his judgment of the shepherds in Sannazaro's *Arcadia*. His observation was based on the idea that, through words, the shepherds treated pagan deities like the Christian God. In his introduction to *De Petrarcha* he explains why inappropriate use of language can result in blasphemy, and in his examination of *Canzoniere* he shows how the poet uses words to present himself as an idolater.

In his analysis of the *Canzoniere*, Barrio sought to distinguish facets of the poet's utterances. He was not concerned so much about the story as he was with Petrarch's voice, probably because he identified the poet-lover with the person Petrarch. In his view Petrarch not only writes, he also speaks ("dicit"), shows ("ostendit"), complains ("queritur"), prays ("exorat"), calls ("vocat", "appellat"), curses ("maledicit"), speaks ("ait"), remembers ("commemorat"), pretends or simulates ("simulat"), detracts ("detrahit") and lays claim to heaven ("os in coelum ponere ausus est").[30] Barrio describes and defines Petrarch's verbal expressions, showing that he had interpreted and classified the text.

A similar approach to examining the intention behind words can be identified in a censorship of Julius Caesar Scaliger's Latin *Poemata.* Due to the harsh criticism of popes, the clergy and the religious, the poems were discussed twice by the Congregation for the Index, prohibited and included in the second class of the *Index* in the late 1580s.[31] Michele Mercati, the censor who assessed the poems, observes Scaliger's attacks on priests ("Pag. 76. invehitur in sacerdotos incertos") and his harassment of the religious ("De monachis ubique libenter vexat") and castigation ("proscindit") of the clerics, the Roman court and Roman Pontiffs in "pungent satire" ("amarulenta satyra"). He classifies and defines Scaliger's utterances, drawing attention to authorial intention, an indication that he consciously dealt with modes of expression. Like Barrio, Mercati perceived verbal expression to be an action because, through words and their meaning, something happens to the readers.

In addition, Mercati identifies literary genres used by Scaliger. He points to pasquinades ("Pasquilli 208, 221 contra Romam") and a satire that he describes as "bitter" or "pungent" ("amarulenta").[32] His reference to literary genres testifies to his sensitivity to verbal expression in its textual form. In marking pasquinades against Rome, Mercati was faithful to the Roman *Index* that

30 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3b.

31 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 33r.

32 'Censura in Carmina Julij Ces. Scaligeri' [liber impressus est in forma ottava, anno 1574, sed neque loci, neque impressoris nomen est adscriptum], ex observatione D. Michaelis Mercati, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. H, 508r–v, 508v.

prohibited texts pertaining to the genre if they disparaged the Roman Church. In mentioning satire he was in line with contemporary censorship politics, as the above-mentioned Sistine *Rules* shows. His description of the satire as "pungent" is important because, like the verbs *invehire*, *vexare* and *proscindere* it expresses Mercati's interpretation of the poems and the author's intention.

Examples of criticism of the laity appear in censorships of the *Divina Commedia* and Castelvetro's commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics*. Barrio observes that several unidentified people in *Commedia* were detracted in *Inferno*. Although his observation is vague, one must not underestimate its significance. Through his definition of Dante's invectives as detractions, Barrio accuses Dante of repeatedly committing a grave sin because several people were disparaged. Even though Barrio focuses on Dante's treatment of popes, prelates and the religious, it is possible that the reference to many undefined souls is also to laypeople, as his example of the Priscian-passage (*Inf.* 15.109–111) focuses on laypeople. Barrio states Priscian and, by his 'person', grammarians were accused of and criticized for sodomy.[33]

The preceding lines also accuse clerics of sodomy (*Inf.* 15.106–108). It is very likely that Barrio expected his readers to find the clerics in the text. It is noteworthy that they are not at the center of the accusation. Barrio understood that Dante had censured and criticized grammarians as though they were "fellow sleepers of men" ("Canto XV Priscianum et in persona illius grammaticos taxat et mordet quasi masculorum concubitores.") This explanation clearly shows that Barrio sensed a tone of condescension and humiliation. Barrio's censorship may have been due to Priscian's status and reputation as a grammarian since *Inter sollicitudines* had been a reaction to criticism of high-standing ecclesiastical and secular personalities; in other words, authorities.

A similar approach was employed by Vincenzo Guarini in his censorship of Castelvetro's commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics*, in which criticism of literary authorities was considered in need of expurgation. Guarini, apparently familiar with Aristotle's *Poetics*, remarked that Castelvetro questioned "praecepta" of the work. There is nothing in the work, Guarini claims, that Castelvetro had not tried to refute through acute syllogisms. Guarini points out that Castelvetro accused renowned authors such as Euripides, Pindar, Lucretius, Virgil, Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto, and *minime* Homer, Cicero, and Boccaccio of "many things" ("in multis") and considered them ignorant of writing. He carped ("carpit") and rebuked ("obiurgat") with biting sarcasm ("canina mordacitate") like a disciple

33 Dante Alighieri, *Dante con l'espositione di M. Bernardino Daniello da Lucca, sopra la sua Comedia dell'Inferno, del Purgatorio et del Paradiso*, nuovamente stampato e posto in luce (Venice: Pietro da Fino, 1568), 105, and Landino, in *Dante con l'espositioni*, 86v.

of the Cynic philosopher Diogenes. Guarini believed that once these defects were corrected, the work could be permitted for use by scholars.[34]

The manner in which criticism was expressed, such as choice of words, tone, and intention, were all nuances that these and other censors perceived. This is not surprising, as many of them had been educated in poetry, rhetoric and homiletics.

6.2 Privileged Treatment of Italian Vernacular Poetry and National Sentiment?

In some instances censors were given particular instructions regarding censorship, as in the censorships of Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, Ariosto's *Furioso* and *Satire* and Alunno's *Ricchezze*. A document on the first expurgation of the *Decamerone* explains that only intolerable errors were to be corrected, such as errors against the Catholic faith. "Love things" ("cose d'amore et casi amorosi") were to be tolerated; the work had not been prohibited due to erotic immorality.[35] The inquisitor of Ferrara responsible for Ariosto's *Satire* and Alunno's *Ricchezze* was told by Cardinal Valier to proceed moderately and to delete as little as possible so that the sense of the works would not be altered. Valier suggested varying some words while ensuring they were proportionate and reasonable.[36] Similar orders may account for the alleged disinterest in the protection of the laity against mockery other than for the purpose of respecting the spiritual hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. Such orders demonstrate that concessions were made to poetry. If laws such as *Rule* VII had been rigorously applied to the *Decamerone*, the uncensored portion of the work would not have been substantial enough for a book.

Privileged treatment of vernacular poetic works appreciated for their literary value is not expressed in the *Index*. As is well known, ancient pagan Greek and Latin authors whose works contained "lascivious or obscene things" were treated with leniency because of their elegance and style (*Rule* VII), and paragraph § iv of the Clementine *Instructio de correctione librorum*, referred to above, protected works by ancient Catholic authors. There is evidence that exceptions were made when vernacular texts were deemed linguistic models

34 See Appendix, doc. 1.12a.

35 See Chiecchi and Troisio, 33.

36 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. v, i, 132v.

useful for learning. This has been pointed out by Annamaria Coseriu, but she does not believe it furthers the understanding of Roman censorship.[37]

Correspondence between the Roman and local censorial authorities suggests that works written in the *bella lingua* were valued and were to be treated accordingly:

> Firenze. Vicario Molto Reverendo Signor come fratello.
> Nel tempo del vostro Predecessore fu dato il carico in Firenze con l'aiuto de quelle Academie, et de tanti Theologi d'espurgar tutti li libri di bella lingua, che patiscono qualche censura . . .
> 16.7.99 come fratello Cardinale Terranova.[38]

In the case of the *Decamerone*, Roman authorities welcomed the involvement of religious and lay philologists who were able to approach the text with linguistic skill.[39] Other examples of this somewhat moderate orientation can be found in the cases of the *Orlando Furioso*, Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi* and Dante's *Divina Commedia*. While the censorial authorities made attempts to proceed against the *Furioso* and, to a certain degree, against the *Canzoniere* by prohibiting the sonnets criticizing the Curia, they tried to remain silent about the *Commedia* despite its harsh criticisms of popes, prelates, the clergy and the religious. This is suggested by sixteenth-century Roman blacklists and files of the Congregation for the Index, but if one examines the *Commedia*'s case more closely, it is clear the issue is more complex.

Two judgments on the *Commedia* show that political, religious and cultural interests were taken into account in the censorship of poetic criticism of popes, prelates, clergy and the religious. A kind of pre-national consciousness or sentiment played a part in connecting these interests, and the two judgments demonstrate how censorial criteria were interpreted and adjusted accordingly. One was Barrio's censorship; the other was authored by Bellarmine as part of his *Responsio ad librum quondam anonymum cuius titulus est Aviso piacevole dato alla bella Italia*.[40]

Even if, theoretically, the censorship of poetry was based on legalities, its practice was a challenge to censors who had to interpret and judge complex poetic texts. The sources show that the censors were aware that interpretation

37 Cf. Coseriu in her study on the three *rassettature* of the *Decameron*.

38 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. V, 95v.

39 See Chiecchi and Troisio, 31.

40 On the case of Dante see also my article 'Dante and the Authority of Knowledge' (forthcoming).

was a grey area, and that they could use that to their advantage. Barrio and Bellarmine's judgments were used on different occasions for different purposes, but—and this is enlightening—they dealt with the same passages, revealing different perspectives of the poem and different ways of approaching vernacular poetry.

Barrio first published a comment on the *Commedia* in *Pro lingua latina* as early as 1554. He composed a second comment on the basis of the first, which, as part of his elaborate censorship file on vernacular poetry, entered Sirleto's codexes. By contrast, Bellarmine's judgment given in his *Responsio* to the anonymous *Aviso piacevole* pertained to European political and religious conflict. The *Aviso* has generally been attributed to the Calvinist François Perrot.[41] It is a polemical pamphlet against Pope Sixtus V, who had excommunicated King Henry of Navarre and the Duke of Condé in September 1585. It decries Sixtus V as the Antichrist and, in order to support this accusation, attaches brief editorial comments and passages taken from works by the Three Crowns. In order to successfully refute the *Aviso piacevole*, Bellarmine had to cope with the *Aviso piacevole's* interpretation of the three poets.

Bellarmine's judgment of Dante was therefore neither a censorship, nor purely about Dante. It was part of a larger and more serious international religious and political context in which Dante's work was used as an instrument by the anonymous author and interpreted and defended by Bellarmine, rendering his reading and judgment of the *Commedia*, in comparison to Barrio's judgment, interesting from the censorial point of view. In regard to Dante, Bellarmine had to deal with the assaults launched against popes and clerics which had been severely censored by Barrio. He also had to explain passages in which the anonymous author claimed to have found ideas close to Protestantism.

Both of Barrio's judgments in *Pro lingua latina* and his censorship, dealt extensively with Dante's invectives, particularly against men of the Church. In one of the examples Barrio identifies a victim by name, namely a pope. In the shade ("ombra") of "colui / che fece per viltade il gran rifiuto" (*Inf.* 3.59–60), Barrio recognizes Pope Saint Celestine V, who had abdicated "because of cowardice." When Dante the pilgrim and Virgil enter Hell's Gate, they hear sighs and lamentations. Virgil explains that this is the miserable fate of those who lived without infamy and praise (*Inf.* 3.36) and they are the sect of "i cattivi, / a Dio spiacenti e a' nemici sui" (*Inf.* 3.62–63). They appear naked, tormented by mosquitoes and wasps and blood mingles with tears on their faces and is

41 On the authorship of the *Aviso* see Jean Balsamo, 'Dante, l'*Aviso piacevole* e Henri de Navarre', *Italique* 1 (1998), 79–94 <http://italique.revues.org/index89.html> 14. June 2010.

absorbed by the worms on their feet (*Inf.* 3.64–69). It is through this representation that Barrio accuses Dante of "temerity" ("temeritas") and "madness" ("dementia"). He underlines Dante's irreverence towards a canonized pope by saying that Dante dared ("ausus sit") to place this pope among the criminals and impious, thereby attributing cowardice to him (*Inf.* 3.58–60).[42]

Barrio read this representation literally and comments that Dante had condemned this pope to Hell ("damnans in inferis"). From Barrio's perspective Dante had judged the pope. Whether Dante wrote this passage before or after the pope's canonization does not play a role here. Even if this judgment seems, as we shall soon see, quite severe compared to that of Bellarmine, Barrio was not the only one who wished to protect the name of this pope. The Spanish *Index librorum expurgatorum* of 1584 demanded that the name of Pope Celestine be deleted from the *Argomento* accompanying the commentaries of Landino and Vellutello to the *Commedia*.[43]

In Barrio's *censura*, Pope St Celestine serves as the first example introducing a good number of invectives against popes and clerics and hence the Roman Church. By contrast, only one example is given to prove invectives against laypeople. Barrio finds popes to be "detracted" in *Inferno* 27 because Dante criticized them for using the 'supreme keys' in the papal seal for material ends.[44] It has often been argued that targets of Dante's criticism were just single personalities. But Barrio endeavored to furnish evidence that Dante had gone so far as to "detract" ("detrahit") the entire Roman Church in the canto of the simonists (*Inf.* 19), where the accusation of simony went hand in hand with idolatry.[45] Barrio might have had in mind the interpretation of the Babylon passage in St John's *Apocalypse*, in which Dante the pilgrim believes Roman popes are described (*Inf.* 19.106–111). Dante applied an interpretation of St John's allegory which, as the fourteenth-century manual of the inquisitor Eymerich shows, was condemned as a heresy of Peter John Olivi by Pope John XXII.[46]

Dante's commentators were aware of the problem inherent in the speech of Dante the pilgrim. Landino and Vellutello begin their commentary on this scene with the lines

42 Barrio, *PLL*, 420, for the censorship Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

43 Cf. *ILI*, vi, 991.

44 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

45 Ibid.; on *Inf.* 19.48–117 see also Caesar, 31 and 36.

46 See Eymerich and Peña, pars 2, *Quaestiones quinquaginta octo de haeretica pravitate ad officium Inquisitionis pertinentes*, quaest. 9, see 19th heresy.

> Io non so s'i' mi fui qui troppo folle
> ch'i' pur risposi lui a questo metro (*Inf*. 19.88–89),

demonstrating that Dante the pilgrim is indeed aware of his harsh words against the popes.[47] Other targets of "detraction" identified by Barrio are friars of the mendicant orders in *Paradiso* 11 and 12. Cardinals, he points out, are denounced as "beasts" (*Par*. 21.134) and he observes further detractions of the Roman Church both in this canto and in *Paradiso* 23.[48]

Dante makes another statement about the Roman Church in the passage surrounding the verse "e non crediate ch'ogne acqua vi lavi" (*Par*. 5.75), where Barrio finds the power ("potestas") of the Roman Church to be detracted.[49] Barrio's interpretation appears to go beyond the intended meaning, but Dante's wording is indeed general, opening the possibility of different readings.[50] Interestingly, this verse is immediately followed by the famous tercet in which Dante explains that a Christian needs only the Holy Bible and "the shepherd of the Church" ("pastor della Chiesa," *Par*. 5.76–78) for salvation. Critics generally maintain that the "pastor" refers to the pope, but these lines are ambiguous. From Barrio's standpoint the ambiguous wording had the potential to arouse suspicion and, if he did not recognize the pope as represented by the shepherd, he would not have been the first. Landino understood that the shepherd represented priests,[51] and made no mention of the pope. If Barrio had been familiar with Landino's commentary as was Bellarmine, and he was looking for obscure, suspect, and potentially heterodox passages, he could even have found a parallel to Protestant ideas.

That Barrio's censorship might have been exaggerated in some cases becomes evident in his interpretation of *Paradiso* 9. Barrio believes that Dante criticizes the papal decretals and their study ("vituperat epistulas decretales pontificum et earum studium"). Yet it is only the abuse of canon law that is at stake; Gratianus, the founder of the science of canon law, is placed in *Paradiso* (*Par*. 10.104–105).[52]

---

47 Landino, also Vellutello, in *Dante con l'espositioni*, 102r.

48 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

49 Ibid.

50 See Dante, *Paradiso*, ed. Umberto Bosco (Florence: Le Monnier, 1979), on *Par*. v.75.

51 See Landino on *Par*. 5, in *Dante con l'espositione*, 299v.

52 See the introduction by Giuseppe Dalla Torre, in Lia Fava Guzzetta (ed.), *Dante e i papi. Altissimi cantus: riflessione a 40 anni dalla Lettera Apostolica di Paolo VI* (Rome: Studium, 2009), 20–3, 23, but on *Paradiso* 9.136–42 see Caesar, 31 and 36.

Imagery was another means of expression taken into consideration by Barrio. He found criticism of the Catholic cult and Christians' piety in *Inferno*, where Dante describes the souls of the damned in Hell and compares this visual impression with that of masses of pilgrims arriving in Rome for the Jubilee. Barrio believes that Dante derides ("irridet") Christian religion: "Canto XVIII damnatarum animarum multitudinem Romanorum multitudini comparat, qui Iubilei tempore ad divi Petri templum vadunt, super ponte S. Angeli sibi mutuo obviantes, unde aperte Christianam religionem irridet." A similar observation is made regarding *Paradiso* 29.124–126 where Barrio finds Christian piety towards saints to be "derided," and friars of St Anthony, inspired by the devil, are said to profit from the laity's credulity and abuse and even forge indulgences: "de questo ingrasso el porco S. Antonio, irridet Christianorum pietatem erga sanctos."[53]

In contrast, Bellarmine's first example is Pope Anastasius II, whom Dante accused of heresy. According to Bellarmine, this accusation was based on an incorrect record that he describes as "omnia falsa fabulosaque." This explanation seems to soften Dante's sin in such a way as to portray him as a kind of victim, and Bellarmine may have found this example to be the most convincing. At the beginning of *Inferno* 11 we find Dante the pilgrim and Virgil wandering through the sixth circle, which was assigned to heretics. They arrive at the extremity of a high stone mound forming the seventh circle. Dante the pilgrim and his guide are confronted by such a pungent stench ("l'orribile soperchio / del puzzo," *Inf.* 11.4–5), that they are forced to hide behind the lid of a tomb on which was written

> 'Anastasio papa guardo,
> lo qual trasse Fotin de la via dritta.' (*Inf.* 11.6–9)

The two lines accuse Pope Anastasius II of having believed Deacon Photinus, who was said to have adhered to the heretical ideas of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople. He was excommunicated as a heretic by Pope Felix III, resulting in his placement in Hell by Dante. The horrible stench, as Francesco Sansovino explains in an *Allegoria* to *Inferno* 11, mirrors the result ("effetti") of the heretics' wrong teachings because heretics infect those who follow their wrong convictions.[54]

---

53 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3g.

54 Cf. Francesco Sansovino, 'Allegoria' to *Inf.* 11, in Landino and Vellutello, *Dante con l'espositioni*, 65r.

The accusation put forward against the pope is a strong one, and Bellarmine explains that Dante must have followed writings of the Dominican Martinus Polonus, Gratianus and "others". These authors maintained that Pope Anastasius II had sinned by wishing to reinstate the excommunicated Acacius to the see of Constantinople. According to them, Pope Anastasius II communicated with Photinus from Thessaly, a friend of Acacius, without the consent of the other bishops.

To put facts straight, Bellarmine concentrates on Acacius and presents "certissimos testes" according to which Acacius's death preceded Anastasius's pontificate. He concludes that it could not have been this pope who had supported Acacius. Bellarmine points to a letter Pope Anastasius II had written to the Emperor Anastasius I, commanding him not to tolerate the name of this heretic ("ne nomen quidem Acacii tolerandum esse"), but provides no bibliographical reference to the letter. He attributes the misleading records to a confusion of the homonymous pope and emperor, maintaining that the emperor had been infected by the Eutychian heresy and had therefore supported Acacius.[55] It would be impossible to deny that Dante had leveled severe accusations against this pope. In illustrating the misattributions, Bellarmine demonstrates that Dante had been unaware of the case, and classifies the sin as a venial one.

What Bellarmine actually proved was that there are mistakes in the records on this issue. Dante had not accused the pope of believing Acacius; rather, he had referred to the pope's suspicious connection to Photinus with no mention of Acacius. Suspicion, spread among the pope's contemporaries and recorded by Gratianus, was the result of negotiations between Pope Anastasius II and the emperor, in which Deacon Photinus was involved.[56] Bellarmine did not explicitly refute this idea, but instead drew attention to Acacius, although it neither becomes clear how the date of Acacius's death featured in his reasoning, nor to what extent one letter can stand as proof of a conscience.

Interestingly, Pope Anastasius II was accused of heresy for another reason that went unmentioned by Bellarmine. As Henry H. Milman suggests, it is feasible that Dante did not confuse the pope with the emperor. Milman explains that in a letter to the emperor, Pope Anastasius II questioned whether Acacius, excommunicated by a pope, had been damned, and wished to leave

55 Cf. Bellarmine, *Responsio*, 545.

56 Cf. Dante, *Divina Commedia*, i: *Inferno*, note on *Inf.* 9.8.

his judgment to God.[57] The pope preferred to keep silent over Acacius's case and asked the emperor to do the same. Two legates, the Bishops Cresconius of Todi and Germanus of Capua, delivered Anastasius's letter, which included further instructions ("instructionem plenissimam") to Constantinople. The pope employed a typical Roman strategy by keeping quiet. Milman concludes that Pope Anastasius II appeared in Dante's Hell because he was "condemned forever for his leniency to the heresy of Constantinople."[58]

If Milman is right and Dante did not confound the pope and emperor, but intentionally put the pope in Hell, the question arises as to whether Bellarmine knew the background of the story and whether his argumentation was fake, which would actually have fit his strategy. It is highly probable that the letter quoted by Bellarmine was the one cited by Milman because in the letter the pope asks the emperor to keep silent over Acacius ("Precamur itaque clementiam vestram, ut specialiter taceatur nomen Acacii").[59] The question is thus whether this utterance was interpreted by Bellarmine to be the pope's request that the name of Acacius not be tolerated ("ne nomen quidem Acacii tolerandum esse").[60] If so, Bellarmine selected and distorted the facts that supported his argumentation.

Bellarmine's argumentation further reveals information about how this passage might have been treated from the censorial perspective. He states that Dante committed an error which could not be defended.[61] This comment seems to suggest that Bellarmine indirectly confirms that this passage should have been censored, otherwise a reader of the poem could have been confronted with an unjust damnation of a pope. The Jesuit, aiming to give evidence of Dante's orthodoxy, disregards this aspect and mentions neither the fictional ban nor the poetic rendering of the infernal location.

Bellarmine's next example is a pope who was not treated in the *Aviso* but was judged by Barrio. It is the shade commonly associated with Pope St Celestine V (*Inf.* 3). Unlike Barrio and the Spanish Inquisition, Bellarmine wishes to understand the representation of this pope more positively. Although Celestine V is located in Hell's Gate among cowards and Dante the pilgrim explains "il gran rifiuto" with the pope's cowardice, Bellarmine believes Dante had not judged

57 Henry H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity: including that of the popes to the pontificate of Nicholas V* (4th edn., London: Murray, 1867), I, 322, cf. Johannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nota et Amplissima Collectio* (Florence: Zatta, 1762), VIII, 188–9.

58 Milman, 323.

59 Mansi, 189.

60 Bellarmine, *Responsio*, 545.

61 Ibid. 542. Cf. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 160.

the pope. He maintains that Dante's criticism referred only to the pope's voluntary abdication. The pope had been a saintly man ("vir sanctissimus") able to work miracles.[62] Bellarmine might have based his interpretation on the poetic idea of Hell's Gate, which is the location of the souls of those who lived "sanza 'nfamia e sanza lodo" (*Inf.* 3.35–36). This interpretation seems somewhat incomplete. Bellarmine does not take into account the respectful poetic representation of the pope located among other shades described as naked and tormented by insects and worms. In order to place souls in this place Dante must have calculated and classified their deeds in some way. As we have seen in Barrio's censorship, this could have been seen as a form of judgment.

After such a detailed start one wonders why Bellarmine does not continue to deal with the representation of the other four popes used in the *Aviso*. Bellarmine does not open the 'files' of Nicholas III, Boniface VIII, John XXII and Clement V. He offers a fairly superficial excuse, explaining that Dante had criticized these popes based purely on their lives and morality ("ob vitam et mores") rather than on their faith and doctrine ("non ob fidem et doctrinam"). Dante did not refer to them as heretics or antichrists ("neque haereticos aut Antichristos usquam vocat").

What Bellarmine indirectly suggests is that accusing popes and clerics of immorality is less sinful than accusing them of impure faith, and that Dante would have had to be judged differently if he had questioned their faith. This may explain why Bellarmine decided to dedicate so much attention to Pope Anastasius II and treat him right at the beginning. Moreover, he was keen to underline the four additional popes who were identified and criticized in the poem. This is no coincidence but part of Bellarmine's rhetorical strategy. He focuses on the small number of four to make his arguments more visible and convincing. It becomes clear why he did not risk mentioning or defending lines such as

> Questi fuor cherci, che non han coperchio
> piloso al capo, e papi e cardinali,
> in cui usa avarizia il suo soperchio. (*Inf.* 7.46–48)

These lines, in fact, served as the opening example in the Dante section of the *Aviso*. They were supposed to show that Dante did not have a small number of popes in mind because he presents an undefined number of unidentified popes and cardinals as sinners of avarice: These popes and cardinals are condemned to eternal punishment for mortal vice and therefore suffer

62 Cf. Bellarmine, *Responsio*, 546.

physical punishment. It is important, as seen at the beginning of his *Responsio*, that Bellarmine points out that the four popes had all been enemies of the Ghibellines. Dante's attack was not only explained by his political conviction and personal interest but also by his temper. Bellarmine suggests that hate for the enemy rather than love of truth had driven the poet to write such things.[63]

It is not clear why, from Bellarmine's standpoint, the accusation of an immoral way of life is not connected to a lack of faith; how could he assume that Dante had not seen morality related to faith when he had launched his invectives? Bellarmine's explanation makes it sound as though the popes and the clerics had been accused of sins that were meaningless compared to sins connected to the "faith or doctrine." What Dante was talking about and what Bellarmine defines as matters of life and morals ("vita et mores") were sins such as avarice, simony, sodomy and idolatry. With regard to the condemned popes, these sins concerned morality and faith, and spiritual and secular power.[64] None of the terms that Bellarmine could easily have found discussed in Benvenuto da Imola's and Landino's commentaries appear in the *Responsio* and must therefore have been purposely avoided.

One example is *Inferno* 19, censored by Barrio. Pope Nicholas III, who is located in the eighth circle of Hell in the third ditch, is accused of simony.[65] Benvenuto da Imola calls simony a vice against religiosity ("religiositade") and explains that, according to canon law, it could be judged as heresy under certain circumstances.[66] Dante depicts it as adultery in the first tercets of *Inferno* 19 (esp. v. 4), an idea which Landino tries to illustrate through a quotation of St Thomas Aquinas. Landino explains that, through simony, the Church, Christ's bride, becomes "pregnant," not by the Holy Ghost but by a malignant spirit ("spirito maligno"). It would follow that, through simony, God nourishes the children of adultery and not the legitimate ones.[67]

From this perspective Dante's invective seems to be concerned with more than just morality. This canto regards an undefined number of sinners, once again including popes and clerics. It opens with a reference to Simon Mago and his followers ("seguaci") who sell the goods of God ("le cose di Dio") for

63 Cf. Bellarmine, *Responsio*, 546.

64 Cf. Marco Bartoli, 'I Papi della *Divina Commedia*', in Fava Guzzetta, 108–11.

65 On this canto see Foster; Gabriele Muresu, 'Tradimento dei simoniaci (Inferno XIX)', *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch* 68/69 (1994), 5–30.

66 See Benvenuto da Imola on *Inferno* 19, in *La Divina Commedia di Dante*, col commento da Benvenuto da Imola (Venice: Vendelin de Spira, 1477).

67 Cf. Landino and Vellutello, *Dante con l'espositioni*, 99r–v.

gold and silver (*Inf.* 19.1–6). In the *Aviso* it was similarly understood,[68] and an analogy between the *Aviso* and Barrio's censorship becomes clear as Barrio believed the whole Roman Church to be "detracted" in this canto and pointed to the invective delivered by Dante the pilgrim (*Inf.* 19.104–117).

Bellarmine does not enter this discussion of sins and the question of to whom this canto refers. Even the interpretation of the allegory of the Babylonian Whore (*Inf.* 19.106–108) which, according to Eymerich's inquisitorial manual, had been condemned as heretical, is neglected. Bellarmine read this canto according to his designs and tried to highlight positive information. He draws attention to the lines where Dante the pilgrim says that he would speak even more frankly if his reverence for the supreme keys did not forbid it:

> E se non fosse ch'anchor lo mi vieta
> la reverenza de le somme chiavi
> che tu tenesti ne la vita lieta. (*Inf.* 19.100–102)

In these lines Bellarmine finds evidence that Dante had recognized Pope Nicholas III as the "true vicar of Christ." They indirectly prove that Dante, unlike the Protestants, accepted the papacy as a legitimate institution. As to the "comparison" of the pope and the whore, Bellarmine does not deny that Dante made such a comparison, nor does he condemn or censor it. He was clever enough only to question whether Dante's interpretation was right and to refer to the interpretations of the Church Fathers.[69]

The sources of the Congregation for the Index show that the suggestion was made to check the *Commedia* for correction. Shortly afterwards the Landinian edition with commentary figures in the Roman *Index* as a work to be corrected, and this prohibition implied the silent and temporary prohibition of the *Commedia*. It was not until the late 1580s that the Spaniard Alfonso Chacón, in his position as *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index, submitted a note on the *Commedia* to the Congregation, informing it that the Spanish Inquisition had banned both the *Commedia* and Landino's commentary and requested that both works be examined.[70] The Spanish *Index et catalogus librorum prohibitorum* of 1583 and *Index librorum expurgatorum* of 1584

68 Cf. [François Perrot], *Aviso piacevole dato alla bella Italia da un nobile giovane francese, sopra la mentita data dal Serenissimo Re di Navarra a Papa Sisto V* [London: John Wolfe, 1586].

69 Bellarmine, *Responsio*, 546–7.

70 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 243r: "Dantes Alighierius poeta Florentinus omnium quos Italia habuit materna lingua doctissimus et elegantissimus in indice Hispanico absolute

banned the *Commedia* with Landino's commentary until corrected. The *Index* of 1584 refers to the edition of Landino and Vellutello's commentary prepared by Juan Battista Marchio in 1564. It orders the censorship of the *Argomento* on the Celestine passage and Landino's commentary on Dante's judgment of the death penalty for heretics in *Inferno* 10.[71] The Portuguese *Catalogo dos libros que se prohibem* had already banned Landino's commentary and the *Commedia* in 1581, indicating which passages of the commentary were to be purged and demanding that instructions for the correction of the *Commedia* be provided by the Inquisition.[72] Though it may appear misleading that the Spanish prohibitions spoke of the *Commedia* and Dante's "cantos" in referring to one and the same work, according to Chacón, the Spanish prohibition referred to the *Commedia* only.

In 1590, the Roman *Index* listed "Christophori Landini Commentaria in Dantem Aligherium, nisi ex praedicta regularum ratione prius emendentur," which seems to have referred only to Landino's commentary. In the subsequent Roman *Index* of 1593, one finds the entry "Christophoro Landino, sopra la Comedia, e Canti di Dante, se non sarà espurgato." The *Index* of 1596 mentions neither Landino's commentary nor Dante's "canti." The modified entry of 1593 is very close to the Spanish wording, and on the basis of Chacón's interpretation of the Spanish entry we may assume that the entry of 1593 intended the prohibition of the commentary and the poem. In both 1590 and 1593 the prohibition was not absolute, as a corrected version would have been accepted.[73] However, it is interesting that the prohibition of the *Commedia* was included in the *Index* only under the letter "C" for "Cristoforo Landino" and that there is no entry for the poem itself, unlike in the case of Dante's *De Monarchia*. The Congregation for the Index had reasons for this choice.

As Chacón does not mention Barrio's judgment of the *Commedia* or any other Roman censorial treatment of Landino or Dante, but recommends their examination, his comment suggests that he was unaware of the existing censorships on these works. He apparently had no access to or knowledge of

---

prohibetur, revidendus esset ut si quae habeat expurgatione digna tollantur, poesis quae antiqua retineatur, cuius iactura multum linguae Italicae candoris et puritatis deperiret."

71 Cf. *Index et catalogus librorum prohibitorum* (Madrid: Apud Alfonsum Gomezium Regium Typographum, 1583), *ILI*, vi, 954; *Index librorum expurgatorum* (Madrid: Apud Alfonsum Gomezium Regium Typographum, 1584), ibid. 991; Landino, in id. and Vellutello, *Dante con l'espositioni*, 17v and 60v.

72 Cf. *Catalogo dos livros que se prohibem nestes regnos et senhorios de Portugal* (Lisbon: Antonio Ribeiro impressor de sua Illustrissima et Reverendissima Senhoria, 1581), *ILI*, iv, 694–5.

73 See *Index* of 1590, *ILI*, ix, 807 and *Index* of 1593, ibid., 906.

the contents of the archives of the Congregation or the master of the sacred palace. He refers neither to the Portuguese *Catalogo* of 1581 nor to the Sistine *Index* of 1590 but only to the Spanish *Index*. We can therefore assume that his comments were written between 1583 and 1590.

It is remarkable that the Congregation should have left the *Commedia* untouched when one considers its status as a model for vernacular prose, the planned correction of Ariosto's *Furioso* in 1600, the correction of the Church Fathers, and the censorship of Boccaccio's *Decamerone*. The Clementine *Index* of 1596 ordained the lenient treatment of "ancient Catholic" authors, so it is plausible that the correction of Landino's commentary was expected to serve as an indirect means to align the *Commedia* with censorial criteria and Counter-Reformation values, as a kind of indirect censorship. Commentaries were used by the censorial authorities to censor works without touching the original texts, as shown above.

Another aspect comes into play that might go hand in hand with the Clementine instruction on the correction of books. The *Diari* of the Congregation for the Index show that highly valued vernacular works were treated carefully in order to preserve the original text as much as possible.[74] In this context, the lenient censorship of the *Commedia* and Bellarmine's defence become easier to understand. Censors acknowledged the literary value of the poem and were aware of Dante's special role as a vernacular poet as well as of the significance of his poem for the cultural identification of a people. One such censor was Chacón.

Chacón introduces Dante as: "Dantes Alighierius poëta Florentinus omnium quos Italia habuit materna lingua doctissimus et elegantissimus . . ."[75] indicating that, unlike Barrio, he respected Dante as a vernacular poet. Although Italy was not a unified state at the time, Chacón, a Spaniard, seems to have ascribed to Dante the role of vernacular poet of 'Italy.' The roots of the 'national exegesis' of the *Commedia* appear to lie in the nineteenth century.[76] Chacón indirectly insinuates the cultural significance of Dante's work for Italy, and suggests a kind of pre-national sentiment of cultural identity. The cultural role of Dante and his *poema sacro* may well have been a factor that shaped the censorial reception and treatment of the *Commedia*.

This factor became particularly important in the context of the Catholic-Protestant conflict. The Three Crowns were instrumentalized for religious and

74 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. v, 132v (10 October 1600).

75 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 243r.

76 Cf. on Dante as a national symbol of Italy in the nineteenth century, Thies Schulze, *Dante Alighieri als nationales Symbol Italiens (1795–1915)* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2005), 4.

political propaganda, complicating the censorial treatment of their works, as exemplified in the case of the *Commedia*. Boccaccio's *Decamerone* was the first work to be radically prohibited and expurgated; the principal poetic works of the other two Crowns received a rather untypical treatment. The prohibition of single poems of the *Canzoniere* and the silence about the *Commedia* may have been strategic. Aside from the refutation of the *Aviso piacevole*, Bellarmine's efforts might have taken into account the contemporary cultural significance of the Three Crowns.[77] In Dante's case, this could have assured and legitimized Dante's position as an exemplary vernacular poet. It is evident from Bellarmine's and Barrio's judgments that verdicts, however severe or lenient, were influenced by religious, political, and cultural interests linked to a consciousness of religious, political and cultural identity, if not a pre-national sentiment.

Bellarmine's defence, as well as the removal of the *Commedia* from the *Index*, does not imply that the Congregation for the Index had changed its mind about the poem or had no further intentions of correcting it; the *Index* of Trent and the internal files of the Congregation make it quite clear that a prohibited text did not have to be mentioned explicitly in the *Index*. Bellarmine's defence and the removal of the *Commedia* from the *Index* might have been an attempt to avoid scandal provoked by Protestant propaganda. To quietly deal with a text without arousing public interest was a common strategy of the censorial authorities, and applied to Bellarmine's own treatise. The poem was silently prohibited by the Roman *Index*, and should have just as silently been amended, but this did not happen.

6.3 Hidden Dangers in Comic Poetry

Characters relating to the Catholic cult and biblical and Christian history were erased even when they were not criticized, especially from texts of a comic or satiric nature.[78] In the second half of the century censors became increasingly suspicious of the use of religious language and biblical and Christian characters in profane poetry, particularly if they could not understand the poet's intention or if the texts had been written or published during the Catholic-Protestant controversy.[79]

77 Bellarmine, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, 176.

78 See Sberlati, 'La pia ecdotica', 11.

79 Some results of this chapter have been published in my article 'Literary Censorship: The Case of the *Orlando furioso*', in *La censura ecclesiastica in età moderna, Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica*, 1 (2012), 193–214.

Characters relating to the cult were used by some poets to invoke laughter. Rather than supporting Sacred Scripture and Christian history, the depictions were distorted and deformed, displaying different features and character traits. From the censorial point of view, such poetic depictions not only mingled the sacred with the profane, they also abused or even falsifed sacred texts, doctrine and history, demonstrating a lack of respect towards human and supernatural beings. Often such depictions were explained away by poetic licence ("petulantia"),[80] but censors such as Galletti and Barrio sensed that distortions of religious characters and other religious elements could mask heterodox ideas or messages.

Barrio collated depictions of religious characters from biblical history in his judgment of the *Furioso*. One of his aims was to prove that these depictions were used to indirectly express heterodox ideas close to Protestantism. Comic content lent texts the appearance of harmlessness. Barrio judged Ariosto to be a Lutheran heretic ("qui in Lutheranam haeresim lapsus, ea, de qua scripsit, agitatus furia semet interemit vanitatis suae praemia recepturus") and was eager to demonstrate how Ariosto's writings could endanger Catholic readers. Although Barrio denied the necessity of allegorical interpretation of profane vernacular poetry, his censorship proves that he knew that allegorical interpretation of poetry was not only possible but indeed practiced by contemporary readers such as laypeople, clergymen and the religious. Barrio drew attention to an abbot named Rheginus who was dedicated to the interpretation of the *romanzo* and an unnamed bishop who studied Petrarch, who may possibly have been Bishop Minturno. According to Barrio, this bishop felt no shame, declaring himself a servant of the muses of vulgar vanities, the understanding being that the nine muses represented the nine choirs of angels.[81] Barrio realized that Minturno mingled the sacred and profane, and perhaps even sought divine truth in it.

At the start of his judgment, Barrio concentrates on religious elements as he had in his earlier censorships of *Canzoniere*, *Trionfi* and *Divina Commedia*. These elements are examined with regard to their meaning and function in the context of the story. One example is Astolfo's journey to the Earthly Paradise and the lunary world, which had also attracted the attention of Gabriele Paleotti, who reported to the Congregation for the Index. While Paleotti only mentioned the episode without explaining it, Barrio stayed true to his technique of examining characters, actions and speech in addition to language.[82]

80 See Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, ch. ii, 3.

81 See Appendix, doc. 1.3h, Minturno, [x].

82 Cf. Fragnito, 'Li libbri non zò rrobba da cristiano', 125–6.

Astolfo's journey is described in cantos 34 and 35 where he visits Hell for the first time before riding a hippogriff to the Earthly Paradise where he meets the saints John, Elijah and Enoch. St John explains to Astolfo that he has been chosen and led there by God in order to recover Orlando's wits ("senno"). The saints offer him fruits that are of a particular sweetness, and together with St John he travels in Elijah's chariot of fire to the lunary world. Once on the moon, St John explains to Astolfo that everything there had been lost on earth and was being stored on the moon.

Barrio focuses very much on the depiction of St John in his role as the author of the Gospel of John: St John the Evangelist is in Earthly Paradise; he is there together with Enoch and Elijah; Ariosto jokes ("nugatur") about St John showing and explaining all places of Paradise to Astolfo; St John offers Astolfo fruits said to be so sweet that Adam and Eve should be excused for having disobeyed God's law. Barrio concludes that Ariosto questioned God's judgment of the first parents:

> Joannem Evangelistam in paradiso terrestri cum Enoc et Helia esse dicit eumque Astolfo omnia paradisi loca ostendisse et declarasse nugatur eique paradisi fructus ad edendum dedisse, qui tantae inquit suavitatis erant, ut merito primi parentes excusentur quod Dei praecepto non obedierint, quasi Deus iniuste eos punieret.

Barrio adds a note in the margin commenting that Ariosto had not been aware that God had stationed the cherub at the entrance of Paradise: "Nesciens miser et temerarius, quod Deus ibi angelum custodem misit."[83] This is another indication that he expected poets to conform their works to biblical and Christian 'truth.' He understood the narrated facts literally and did not accept alterations made for poetic purposes.

A more important aspect of his comment, however, is the idea of God's unjust punishment:

> De' frutti a lui del paradiso diero,
> di tal sapor, ch'a suo giudicio, sanza
> scusa non sono i duo primi parenti,
> se per quei fur sì poco ubbidienti. (*OF* 34.60.5–8)

Barrio does not primarily concentrate on irreverence, formal abuse of religious characters and elements taken from the Sacred Scripture; he tries to

83 See Appendix, doc. 1.3h.

understand the meaning of the passage, focusing on the question of divine justice which he believes to have been denied. The idea of divine injustice or unrighteousness implies that God had not taken the flavor ("sapor") of the fruit into consideration when judging Adam and Eve's sin. From this perspective his punishment seems arbitrary, putting his judgment into question. Barrio may have also inferred from this reading that ideas of predestination, salvation or condemnation and of the *liberum arbitrium*, as imagined by Protestants, are hidden here: Adam and Eve may have been destined to eat the fruit, and Adam and Eve may have served only as examples to communicate Ariosto's heterodox religious ideas, as evident in the next example.

Barrio continues his observations on canto 34, but does not make clear whether he understood the change of scenery from Paradise to the moon. Ariosto describes "there" ("ibi") as consisting of woods and hunting nymphs, lovers' vows, sighs and tears as well as overturned soups which, St John explains, represent rejected alms. It seems that "there" refers to Paradise, but it could also refer to the entire canto 34 because, in his judgment of *Divina Commedia*, Barrio uses the word "ibi" as a bibliographical reference to indicate cantos. The former case implies that Barrio believed the described landscape, inhabitants and their emotional lives to be part of Ariosto's Paradise rather than the lunary world. His criticism is best explained by his possible inattention to the change of scenery; it seems more plausible that he criticized the depiction of profane nymphs and lovers in Paradise than on the moon as he does not even mention the moon:

> Ibi silvas et nymphas bellva venantes et amantium vota, suspira et lachrimas esse nugatur. Ibi dapes deiectas in acervum esse, quas elemosinas esse mentitur, quae pro animarum salute post mortem offerentur, quare suffragia pro defunctis irridet. Idque tantum apostolum dixisse nugatur.[84]

Barrio's observation that St John showed and explained Paradise to Astolfo does not actually follow the text. While in Paradise St John offers an explanation as to why Astolfo had been brought there, but it is not until they are on the moon that Astolfo receives an explanation of all that he sees. Barrio's comment could possibly be accounted for by the fact that he quoted the text by heart. as Passarelli has suggested that Barrio quoted from *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi* by heart. This seems somewhat strange if one considers that Barrio worked for Sirleto, who was closely connected to the Congregation for the Index and the

84 Ibid.

Vatican Library (keeper from 1555 to 1557, cardinal librarian from 1572 to 1585).[85] One would expect Barrio to have had access to the treasures of the poetic world. It is also possible that Barrio used an edition of the *Furioso* but worked too quickly and superficially. The circumstances of this censorship have yet to be reconstructed.

Barrio classified woods, animal-hunting nymphs, and lovers' vows in Paradise as a mingling of the sacred and the profane, but the depiction of the *suffragia* was deemed a derision (cf. "irridet") and lie (cf. "mentitur"), recalling Protestant ideas. St John explains that these soups are alms left by sinners after death:

> Di versate minestre una gran massa
> vede, e domanda al suo dottor che importe.
> —L'elemosina è—dice—che si lassa
> alcun, che fatta sia dopo la morte.—(*OF* 34.80.1–4)

Depicted as overturned soups located on the moon, these alms are part of what one loses or wastes on earth; they are worthless. As it is not clear whether Barrio understood the change of scenery, it is difficult to say if he totally understood the imagery of the lost items. What is clear is that he acknowledged Ariosto mocking the idea of giving alms after death; he may have read the alms as *pars pro toto*, an allusion to the abuse of works, rituals, and formal ceremonies 'undertaken without true faith,' intuiting a resemblance to Protestantism.[86]

In this context, Barrio gets back to the depiction of St John. His comment on canto 34 ends with the observation that Ariosto has St John utter the derision of the alms. ("Idque tantum apostolum dixisse nugatur.") At the beginning of the comment Barrio enumerates all three saints whom Astolfo encounters, but he observes that it is St John who explains Paradise, offers fruit and expresses the derisive idea about the rejected alms. Barrio's interest in the character of St John not only sprang from a desire to meticulously list all elements taken from Sacred Scripture, he also seems to have sensed why Ariosto had chosen 'St John the Evangelist' (*OF* 57.8) for this role.

Barrio understood that the characters fulfilled a function in the semantic structure. Even if he did not call it such, he recognized a writing strategy. Since he assessed Ariosto as a Lutheran heretic, thereby demonstrating his familiarity with Lutheranism, he might have known that St John had been highly valued by Martin Luther, who had exploited St John's gospel in his discussion

85 Cf. *Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione*, see 'Sirleto, Guglielmo'.

86 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3h.

of the *liberum arbitrium*.[87] Significantly, St John introduces himself to Astolfo as the author of the gospel, not of the Apocalypse. This detail is picked up by Barrio and could be the key to his interpretation. Barrio may also have been suspicious about the roles of Elijah and Enoch.

Barrio notes another writing strategy of Ariosto, namely the element, or nature, of the comic in canto 34. He comments three times that Ariosto jokes ("nugatur") in canto 34. Twice he refers to the depiction of the strangely shaped and oddly speaking St John, a possible attempt to draw attention to the idea that the "nugae" constitute potential danger. He might have viewed them as giving the text a trivial and innocent tone, obscuring the poet's indirect communication of dangerous ideas. Barrio therefore sought to warn readers not to be deceived by the comic and fabulous stories, suggesting his awareness of a writing strategy, even if he did not refer to it as such, that could also be used by other poets.

St Michael's visit to the monastery where he encounters personified vices is another example that was denounced not only by Barrio but also by Paleotti:

> . . . Gola, Avarizia et Ira,
> Superbia, Invidia, Inerzia e Crudeltade.
> Di tanta novità l'angel si ammira:
> andò guardando quella brutta schiera,
> e vide ch'anco la Discordia v'era. (*OF* 14.81.4–8)

In this scene Barrio observes a criticism of the religious ("multa adversus religiosos viros scribit.").[88] Understanding the vices to be personifications, he indicates that St Michael finds Discordia only in monasteries. It is important that he speaks of monasteries ("in monasteriis") in the plural (cf. *OF* 27.37.1), and uses the phrase "among religious men and women" ("inter religiosos viros ac mulieres"). From the representation of the monastery, as well as possibly from the lines where St Michael imagines finding Silence in churches and monasteries ("in chiese e in monasteri," *OF* 14.79.1–4), Barrio concludes that this criticism was meant to be a general judgment on monasteries. He recognizes that instead of virtue, which one would expect in a monastery, there were vices, particularly capital vices. He thought the personifications might have represented symptoms of the diabolical seduction of the monks. It is therefore no surprise that Barrio also points to the depiction of the monastery as a "new

87 Ibid. On St John and Luther, see Martin Luther, *De servo arbitrio/Vom unfreien Willensvermögen*, trans. A. Lexutt, in id., *Der Mensch vor Gott*, ed. Wilfried Härle (Leipzig: Evang. Verl.-Anst., 2006), 435–7, 539–41, 625–7, 631–7, 641–9.

88 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.3h.

hell" ("nuovo inferno," *OF* 14.82.5) through which Ariosto reinforces the criticism by alluding to divine justice and the punishment of sin.

Barrio does not explain his censorship. Such a depiction did not conform to the Tridentine decree *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* of 8 April 1546. It was not faithful to the canonical texts and did not respect the Catholic 'truth.'[89] Ariosto had sketched a profane and satiric deformation of the archangel portrayed in the Sacred Scripture. One might expect that Barrio, as well as Ariosto, remembered some connotations of St Michael such as his role as Israel's guardian (Dan. 12:1) or his combat with a dragon, a devil and angels in *Revelation* (Rev. 12:7–8). It is possible that Barrio found allusions to biblical combat between angels and devils beyond the deformation of the biblical character, as he drew attention to Protestant implications. Through these allusions the idea of the opposition of St Michael and the angels versus the rebellious angels is projected onto the encounter between St Michael and the vices in the monastery.

Galletti observes a wide range of problems in the text involving the mingling of the sacred and the profane.[90] This mingling can be described more precisely as the fabulous distortion of the Catholic 'truth,' the depiction of superstitious elements, heterodox ideas of the doctrine, as well as the severe criticism of immoral performance of the clergy and religious and misogynistic utterances. Galletti criticizes immorality of an erotic nature but does not delve into it.[91] He recommends erasing stanzas in which a hermit seeks to rape Angelica (*OF* 8.49–50), as they combine erotic and criminal elements with criticisms of the religious.[92]

Among the censored passages are episodes narrating St Michael's visit to the monastery (*OF* 14.27) and Astolfo's journey to the moon (*OF* 34–35), both denounced by Barrio. Galletti's interpretation differs. Although he concentrates on and examines the depiction of the characters and their performances, speech and feelings, he was not able to penetrate the metaphor. He recommends expurgating, if not completely deleting the depiction of the archangel's encounter with the vices in canto 14. Galletti understood the vices to be personifications of the vices of the religious. In his view the depiction is "unjust" towards the "noble status of the religious," and he feels that stanzas 81 and 82 should be suppressed:

89 See *Insuper eadem sacrosancta*, 665.

90 Cf. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 159.

91 Cf. Galletti's letter from June 1597 to Cardinal Santori, in ibid., doc. III 69.

92 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

> Nel 14 canto e degno di lima e di martello il pensier temerario d'introdurre S. Michele in Dialogo con la fraude, e la discordia, ma quando paia da tolerarsi, expungantur omnino, l'ottantesima prima e l'82 stanze cotanto ingiuriose al nobilissimo stato de religiosi.
>
> [Né Pietà, né Quïete, né Umiltade,
> né quivi Amor, né quivi Pace mira.
> Ben vi fur già, me ne l'antiqua etade;
> che la cacciâr Gola, Avarizia et Ira,
> Superbia, Invidia, Inerzia e Crudeltade.
> Di tanta novità l'angel si ammira:
> andò guardando quella brutta schiera,
> e vide ch'anco la Discordia v'era.
>
> Quella che gli avea detto il Padre eterno,
> Dopo il Silenzio, che trovar dovesse.
> Pensato avea di far la via d'Averno,
> che si credea che tra' dannati stesse;
> e ritrovolla in questo nuovo inferno,
> (ch'il crederia?) tra santi ufficii e messe.
> Par di strano a Michel ch'ella vi sia,
> che per trovar credea di far gran vita. (*OF* 14.81–82)]

In canto 27, Ariosto describes the reaction of St Michael, who understands that Discordia has not obeyed God. St Michael not only rages, blushes, beats and kicks ("dà pugna e calci") Discordia, he also breaks the handle of a crucifix over her head. From the censorial point of view this scene recalls the celestial combat between faithful and rebellious angels. Galletti points to the human behavior Ariosto bestows on the archangel. Galletti recognizes "stupid affects" ("affetti sciochi") explained by the shame of not being obeyed ("d'esser poco ubbidito"). He considers these feelings affects of mythological deities and improper for an archangel or Christian. He recommends deleting the description of the Archangel's flushing face ("nel viso s'arrossì l'angel beato"). He deems this poetic licence inconsiderate ("una licenza inconsideratissima") because the Archangel, a defender of the Church ("un defensor della Chiesa"), breaks the handle of a venerable crucifix ("tanto venerabile stendardo"):[93]

93 Ibid.

Nel viso s'arrossì l'angel beato,
parendogli che mal fosse ubidito
al Creatore, e si chiamò ingannato
de la Discordia perfida et tradito.
. . .
Al monister, dove altre volte avea
la Discordia veduta, drizzò l'ali.
Trovolla ch'in capitulo sedea
a nuova elezïon degli ufficiali;
e di veder diletto si prendea,
volar pel capo a' frati i brevïali.
Le man le pose l'angelo nel crine,
e pugna e calci le diè senza fine.

Inde le roppe un manico di croce
per la testa, pel dosso e per le braccia. (*OF* 27.35.1–4, 37, 38.1–2)

The *Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto* concludes with canto 30 and "the second part" ("seconda parte") of the *Furioso* begins with canto 35, where St John reappears (here *OF* 35.20ss). It is odd that Galletti makes no comment on canto 34, which was criticized by both Barrio and Paleotti. This is particularly curious when one considers the caution demonstrated by Galletti in dealing with the character of St John in canto 35, a canto the other two censors had assessed as less dangerous. Galletti pays little attention to the performance or action of the characters; it is the evangelist's speech which catches his attention. Galletti seeks to describe and judge the register of the speech, classifying it as "very low" ("molto bass[o]"). He warns that it contains very strange words ("parole molto strane"). He obviously does not fully understand their meaning and provides no interpretation. His advice is to substitute St John with another character, either to protect the dignity of St John or to delete a semantic element necessary for the understanding of the passage.[94] Naturally, such a substitution would have had consequences on the composition and meaning of canto 34.

Barrio and Galletti dealt with the same episodes in different ways based on their capacities to understand and deal with a literary text. It becomes clear how difficult the judgment of poetry could be for censors, since much experience was needed to understand the complex system and the mechanisms of

94 Ibid. 1.4d.

the different semantic levels. This accounts for Galletti's comment on the first two lines of canto 17:

> Il giusto Dio quando i peccati nostri
> han di remission passato il segno" (17.1.1–2).

Galletti recognizes an idea close to the heresy of the Novatians, also referred to as Cathars,[95] and feels that Ariosto could have been inclined towards it. Galletti admits uncertainty regarding the interpretation and cautions his readers to interpret these lines carefully.[96] By contrast, Barrio offers his interpretation quite confidently explaining that Ariosto deemed divine mercy to be limited.[97]

---

95 Cf. Agostino, *De haeresibus*, para. 38.

96 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.4c.

97 Ibid. 1.3h.

CHAPTER 7

Self-Censorship and Poetic Counter-Strategies
The Case of Domenico Venier

7.1 Between Publication and Censorship

A renowned poet, an incomplete, unpublished manuscript collection of poems containing innumerable corrections, no print edition of the poet's complete works and a censor—what if poet and censor come together in one person in this case? Would one not find a poet who conformed to censorial regulations? It is difficult to prove, but in the case of Domenico Venier self-censorship should be examined in order to better understand his curious performance regarding publication, which has led to at least two questions: Why did this renowned poet not provide for a print edition of his complete works, and what happened to his incomplete manuscript poem collection held at the Library of St Mark's in Venice?

Although the Venetian Patrician Domenico Venier di Zuan Andrea (1517–1582/81 m.v.) was a renowned poet of his time,[1] little is known about his life and work. Around three hundred poetic compositions have been handed down to us, scattered amongst print and manuscript poem collections and anthologies and set to music in music scores.[2] Although Venier supported publishing the poetry of other poets, the publication of his own work was put on hold for two hundred years until Abbot Pier Antonio Serassi undertook to publish an edition of Venier's selected poems.[3]

Among the preserved manuscripts of Venier's work is the Venetian autograph entitled "Canzoniere." It contains a selection of Venier's poems and poem sketches and suggests that since 1550 Venier had been working on a larger lyrical project which he later abandoned.[4] Even if the title "Canzoniere" was not written in Venier's hand, raising the question of whether the collection should be considered a *canzoniere*, its form and content reveal similarities to

1 m. v.: *more veneto*.

2 Cf. Monica Bianco and Guido Baldassari, 'Officina padovana', in Amedeo Quondam (ed.), *Petrarca in Barocco. Cantieri petrarchistici. Due seminari romani* (Rome: Bulzoni, 2004) 327–344, 331.

3 *Rime di Domenico Venier, senatore viniziano*, raccolte ora la prima volta ed illustrate dall'abate Pierantonio Serassi, accademico eccitato, s'aggiungono alcune poesie di Maffeo e Luigi Venieri, nipoti dell'Autore (Bergamo: Pietro Lancellotto, 1751).

4 See Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 589 (9765); on the time estimation, see Balduino, 254.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_008

a *canzoniere*. The manuscript not only contains numerous autograph corrections by the poet, it also shows that major parts of the poems were crossed out, which may be important. According to Monica Bianco, the manuscript served as the basis for another manuscript poem collection, which has not yet been found.[5] The "Canzoniere" is therefore still in need of scholarly attention; why Venier did not terminate his project has not been determined.

Venier's corrections to the poems and the poem sketches give insight into his work. They reveal striking similarities, even analogies, to Counter-Reformation censorship regulations. For this reason it seems worthwhile to analyze the manuscript and look for possible influences of censorship on Venier's poetic work so that his poetic production, performance on publication and perhaps even the destiny of the manuscript can be better understood. One may object that the manuscript, produced in the 1550s, was written too early to be influenced by the Counter-Reformation as the Council of Trent was held between 1545 and 1563 and the first Roman *Index* was published in 1558/59, but biographical facts suggest otherwise.

When Venier abandoned his political career due to bad health in the 1550s, he accepted commissions as a lay censor for the Riformatori dello Studio di Padova and assessed works authors wanted to print.[6] There is a *fede de stampa* of 3rd July 1555, which Venier granted for the publication of Antonio Scaino's book *Tre parti del gioco della palla*; the book had also been examined by Paolo Manuzio and Girolamo Trevisan, Prior of S. Domenico di Castello. Venier likewise granted his approval for the printing of Girolamo Ruscelli's *Vita* of Pietro Aretino on 21 August 1556:

> Faccio fede Domenico Venier come nella vita del signor Pietro Aretino composta dal signor Girolamo Ruscelli per me diligentemente letta non ci ho ritrovato cosa che sia né contra la religion cristiana né contra gli stati né contra i buoni costumi ma letto cose degne di esser stampate et ció ho scritto di mia man propria.[7]

and of Sebastiano Erizzo's Italian translation of Plato's *Timeo* on 23 July 1557:

5 Baldassari and Bianco, 332.

6 On health conditions see, Serassi et al.; for material on his activity as a censor, see Venice, ASV, *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova*, bu. 284. On the Venetian system of censorship, see Paul F. Grendler, *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Printing Press* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), cf. H. F. Brown, *The Venetian Printing Press* (London: Nimmo, 1891).

7 See Venice, ASV, *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova*, bu. 284, fasc. 3, c. 52.

> Faccio fede io Domenico Venier come nel Timeo di Platone tradotto di greco in italiano dal magnifico m. Sebastiano Erizzo non è cosa alcuna contra la religione né contra i principi né contra i buoni costumi et essendo il detto libro di Platone già tanti anni stampato liberamente così greco come latino per tutto il mondo già si vede che si può anchora liberamente stampar tradutto in lingua volgare. Et per fede di ciò ho fatto di mia man propria la presente scrittura.[8]

It may seem strange that a poet became a censor, but at the time it was not unusual for poets, writers or editors to assess the works of others. Girolamo Ruscelli and Lodovico Dolce, Francesco Sansovino and Paolo Manuzio were involved in that type of censorship.[9] Venier's censorial activity is important because it implies that he must have been aware of censorship regulations. Together with other lay censors and the Venetian inquisitor, he had to assure the censorship authorities that the books he examined conformed to the faith, politics and morality of the time. The first Venetian catalogue of prohibited books appeared in 1549 before Venier began his manuscript. By following the blacklists that prohibited Protestant contents, Venier adhered to Counter-Reformation censorship regulations. The work taught him how to perform on the book market. Aside from his good reputation as a poet, this task might also have qualified him to supervise publications of the Accademia della Fama in the late 1550s, which had been founded by his friend Federico Badoer and practiced internal censorship.[10]

Venier worked on his manuscript from September 1550 until the end of the decade. As time progressed, his manuscript became more and more experimental and included numerous incomplete poem sketches. His later writing coincided with his time as a lay censor, which perhaps sheds light on his work, his corrections, and the fact that the majority of his poems was crossed out and the *canzoniere* never completed. One might ask whether his advice on poetry to fellow poets can be regarded as evidence of his reputation as a poet and artistic support, as suggested by Martha Feldman. It is possible that he constructively supported poets using his knowledge of censorship and it is likely it also influenced his own poetic work.

---

8 See Venice, ASV, *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova*, bu. 284, fasc. 4, c. 110.

9 Venice, ASV, *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova*, bu. 284, for Sigonio and Dolce e.g. ibid., fasc. 1, c. 9, for Manuzio, ibid., fasc. 2, c. 20, for Sansovino, ibid., c. 29, for Ruscelli, fasc. 4, c. 110.

10 On the Accademia della Fama, or Accademia Veneziana, see Martha Feldman, 'The Academy of Domenico Venier', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 44/3 (1991), 476–512.

It might be helpful to examine Venier's publications dating from the 1550s. As Massimo Frapolli has observed, Venier's compositions published in *Il sesto libro delle rime di diversi eccellenti autori* form a kind of 'micro-canzoniere'; the volume was prepared by Girolamo Ruscelli and published in Venice in 1553.[11] Frapolli holds that Venier's micro-canzoniere evidences a clandestine *canzoniere* culture. He reminds us that Roberto Fedi discovered a micro-canzoniere by Pietro Bembo in an anthology. Fedi suggested that Bembo had probably chosen this form of publication because he had become a cardinal; it was more discreet than an edition of his love poetry would have been, which would have been considered improper for a cardinal and a contravention of the Counter-Reformation vision of poetry.[12]

If this is true, then anthologies were used to publish clandestine poetry even before the first Roman or Venetian *Indexes* were published. This form of publication should therefore be understood as a kind of counter-strategy used to evade censorship. It would be further evidence that Venier's performance on publication was influenced by the Counter-Reformation and its censorship. Examining contemporary literary and historical developments influenced by censorship may shed more light on this.

The Republic of Venice banned immoral texts as early as the first half of the sixteenth century, well before the first catalogue of prohibited books was published in Venice. A printing privilege was needed even for the publication of songs. Printers were put on trial for illegally printing works by Francesco Berni or novelle by Bandello.[13] It seems a natural consequence that the number of printed profane poetic texts diminished after the Council of Trent while the number of printed religious texts increased.[14] Publications of love poetry written during the second half of the sixteenth century show formal inconsistencies,

---

11 Girolamo Ruscelli (ed.), *Il sesto libro delle rime di diversi eccellenti autori*, nuovamente raccolte et mandate in luce (Venice: al segno del Pozzo, 1553), cf. Massimo Frapolli, 'Un micro-canzoniere di Domenico Venier in antologia', *Quaderni veneti*, 33 (2001), 29–68, 32.

12 Frapolli, 32, Roberto Fedi, *La memoria della poesia. Canzonieri, lirici e libri di rime nel Rinascimento* (Rome: Salerno, 1990), 253–63, 253–5.

13 See Grendler, *The Roman Inquisition*. On Della Casa, see Andrea Del Col, 'Il Nunzio Giovanni Della Casa e l'Inquisizione di Venezia', in S. Carrai (ed.), *Giovanni Della Casa ecclesiastico e scrittore*, Atti del convegno, Firenze—Borgo San Lorenzo, 20–22 novembre 2003 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2007), 1–30; Giuliano Pesenti, 'Libri censurati a Venezia nei secoli XVI–XVII', in *La Bibliofilia*, 58 (1956), 15–30, 15. On Berni see Venice, ASV, *Esecutori contro la bestemmia, Notatorio*, bu. 56, fasc. 1, 64r, on Bandello, ibid. fasc. 2, 28r. Both documents are reproduced in Pesenti, 15.

14 Amedeo Quondam, 'La letteratura in tipografia', in *Letteratura italiana*, ii: *Produzione e consumo*, ed. Alberto Asor Rosa (Turin: Einaudi, 1983), 555–686, here: 641, cf. 622–31, Ugo Rozzo, *Linee per una storia dell'editoria religiosa in Italia* (*1465–1600*) (Udine: Arti Grafiche

and therefore raise questions. In several anthologies, even those prepared by experienced editors like Ruscelli, the tables of contents do not match the actual contents. Names of authors were omitted, even of authors who had not been blacklisted by the Roman Church. Poems were attributed to incorrect authors or presented as anonymous ("incerto autore").[15] One example is the anthology *I fiori delle rime de' poeti illustri* prepared by Ruscelli and printed by Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari in 1556 and Giovambattista et Melchior Sessa fratelli in 1558. It was granted a printing privilege and there are *fedi de stampa* dating from the year 1558, one of which is by Inquisitor Felice Peretti da Montalto, who states that he read and examined the entire book ("... vidimus, legimus et examinavimus totum opus.").[16] If it is true that the inquisitor read the entire book and that the other *fedi de stampa* are affirmative, then the book was deemed acceptable. Nonetheless, the case seems awkward because the book contains love poetry which contravened the Catholic faith, more precisely, the decree *Insuper eadem sacrosancta*. Inquisitor Felice Peretti was known for his severity and was even expelled from Venice; later, as pope, he pursued quite severe censorship policies, so it is difficult to believe that he approved such a book.

As Armando Balduino suggests, such inconsistencies could be explained by the fact that some of these texts had previously circulated in manuscripts, rendering their authorship unclear.[17] It is nevertheless difficult to imagine that in the small literary world of Venice the author of a highly-valued poetic text could have remained unknown, particularly to the compilers of the poem collections and anthologies who were so well connected. Negligence of the printers may have played a role, but such inconsistencies may sometimes have been made intentionally. This may become clearer in the cases of print poem collections that give wrong or incomplete bibliographical information. The editor's names, the printing privilege, the printer's name, and the year or place of publication could be incorrect or missing, for instance.[18]

Changes made to texts after a printing privilege had been granted could likewise account for such inconsistencies. The files of the Inquisition of

---

Friulane, 1993), 70s; cf. the chapter 'Privilegi concessi alla famiglia Giolito (1538–1593)', in Nuovo and Coppens.

15 Armando Balduino, 'Petrarchismo veneto e tradizione manoscritta', in *Petrarca, Venezia e il Veneto*, ed. by Giorgio Padoan (Florence: Olschki, 1976), 243–70, 246, n. 2.

16 For the *fede de stampa* for the *Fiori*, see Venice, ASV, Riformatori allo studio di Padova, bu. 284, 141–141ter.

17 Balduino, 246 at n. 2.

18 For an overview of books whose printers remained anonymous, see Dennis E. Rhodes, *Silent Printers. Anonymous Printing at Venice in the Sixteenth Century* (London: British Library, 1995).

Venice reveal that quite often a text approved by the censorial authorities was changed prior to printing. For this reason, the Inquisition decreed as early as 1569 that the Riformatori dello Studio di Padova should keep a copy of each approved text to compare to the final print version. An interesting case is that of Adrian Willaert's *Musica Nova*, a book of music scores containing sacred and profane pieces that the Duke of Ferrara wished to publish in the 1550s. Except for one, the profane pieces had been set to love poems by Petrarch. The Duke had apparently received advice from Rome not to ask for a printing privilege for this work because the Roman Inquisition was destroying texts by Petrarch at that time. The duke therefore asked the Venetian censorial authorities for a privilege. He submitted the table of contents only, as critics have shown, which did not mention Petrarch's name. One might ask to what exactly Inquisitor Peretti refers in his *fede* for the *Musica nova*, where he writes: "vidimus, legimus et nihil impium invenit." The other *fedi* are attached to this document as well as to the table of contents of the work.[19]

It is well known that Venice houses ample library stocks of manuscripts containing vernacular love poetry, pointing to the existence of a manuscript culture in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The reasons for this rich manuscript culture may be manifold. Yet, although these manuscript stocks include love poetry threatened by Counter-Reformation censorship, this phenomenon has hardly been related to censorship. Among the manuscripts mentioned by Balduino are poem collections of one or more poets, known and unknown, from the first and second half of the century. Among them figure Venier and other members of the Venier family. Only a part of these manuscript poem collections, often accompanied by texts criticizing the moral decay of dignitaries of the Roman Church, has been printed.[20] A lack of financial support and insufficient quality may be the reason why such a manuscript culture existed, especially in the case of poets who were young, unknown and financially less well off. By contrast, the texts included in such manuscript collections written by renowned poets may indicate privately commissioned works, copies for friends and admirers, individual preference for the manuscript form,[21] and perhaps even the influence of the Counter-Reformation.

The number of texts written by noble poets in manuscript form is noteworthy. Martha Feldman assumes that Patrician poets considered it beneath

19 Cf. Venice, ASV, S. U., bu. 156, 4r–v (20 June 1569), see Owens and Agee, doc. 39/269–70, doc. 35/264–266, 265s.

20 Balduino, 245.

21 Ibid. 245–6.

their station to participate in print culture.[22] This seems plausible. Single lyric poems on love were selected for manuscripts and printed in anthologies or music scores, thus published in both forms of text transmission. Patricians seemed reluctant to opt for their own edition of their love lyrics; rather, they published print editions of orations and tragedies and moral, philosophical and political texts. This suggests that the subject and nature of a text influenced the choice of the medium of text transmission as well as its audience.

Poetological debates over love lyrics and philosophy also shed light on Venier's restrained and cautious performance on publication. The first half of the sixteenth century was overshadowed by Girolamo Malipiero's *Petrarca spirituale*. It became more and more important to fit love poetry into a philosophical concept. A philosophical underpinning conforming to the Catholic faith and morality could defend love poetry from accusations of immorality.[23] Apologetic interpretations of Petrarchan love verses as well as the manifold poetic forms of Petrarchist adaptations may testify to this. Among the large number of texts on love philosophy, one in particular has received little scholarly attention.

Between 1557 and 1559, when Venier's work on his manuscript began to slow down, Celio Magno gave a lecture on Petrarch at the Venetian Accademia della Fama entitled *Prefazione sopra il Petrarca*.[24] He spoke up against criticism of love lyrics and measures which aimed to exclude love lyrics from society. Magno was a poet and well-linked to the literary and academic world through his friend Venier, who had supported him as an orphan. Magno was also secretary to the Council of Ten of Venice that, among other things, had elected the State Inquisitors and overseen censorship. It is unsurprising to find that Magno, while preparing the print edition of his *Rime* in 1600, provided a preface on language to satisfy Counter-Reformation censorship exigencies.

Although the *Prefazione sopra il Petrarca* presents itself as praise for the poet, it concentrates on the attempt to refute accusations of immorality that had been put forward against poetry, especially lyric poetry. Only a brief section is dedicated to Petrarch, and it seems as though Magno was endeavoring to embed lyric poetry in a moral and religious context to match the Catholic faith in order to justify and safely place his praise of Petrarch. The presentation of Petrarch's poetry is different from what one would expect from an

22 Feldman, 487 at n. 27 or ead., *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

23 Dionisotti, introduction, in Bembo, *Prose della volgar lingua, Gli Asolani, Rime*, 15.

24 See Magno, 'Prefazione sopra il Petrarca (ms. Marc. It. IX, 171)', in Taddeo 226, or Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 171 (6092), 154r–9v.

academic lecture. Magno does not discuss it from a poetological point of view, but, as the title suggests, focuses on Petrarch. He confirms Petrarch's orthodoxy and the utility that his poetry had for an honest young woman, a learned and austere philosopher and a perfect theologian.[25]

In the late 1550s in Venice, the interpretation of Petrarchan and Petrarchist love lyrics was not only discussed in poetic and poetological fields; critical public voices, as well as those from ecclesiastical circles, were also heard. The Venetian Republic is well known for its successful attempts to restrict the influence of Roman censorship and Inquisition, but it is also known for its Janus-faced politics; religious freedom coexisted with the control of good morals. It is thus possible that the measures taken to suppress love lyrics mentioned by Magno related to measures of the Roman Inquisition, and that the local Inquisition of Venice sought to implement Roman censorship policy.

What influenced Venier's publication, and what became of his manuscript remains unclear. The Inquisition and censorship played active roles in his life; in fact, he was denounced to the Inquisition of Venice on suspicion of Lutheranism in 1576. The case was closed without a judgment, as suggested by the file of the Inquisition of Venice dating from 1576.[26] The file dates from 1576 and thus the case may be acknowledged as a biographical fact but may not explain what happened to the autograph; nonetheless, the overall picture suggests that it would be wise to consider the manuscript in the context of censorial or Counter-Reformation influence.

7.2 A Poetic Apology of Love Lyrics?

Venier did not write the title *Canzoniere* that appears on the cover of his manuscript, so it is possible that the title was not chosen by Venier and added at a later date either with or without his knowledge. As I will later show, different hands were involved in the development of the manuscript, even during the time when Venier was working on it in the 1550s. It is interesting to note that the major part of the poems is crossed out, some poems are marked with numbers and letters, and only a few are accompanied by the annotation "da metter in libro." It has been suggested that Venier was involved in another manuscript project in which parts of this manuscript were used, but the other manuscript has not yet been found. Since the manuscript being discussed contains

25 Magno, 'Prefazione', 232 or Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 171 (6092), 159v.

26 See Federica Ambrosini, *Storie di patrizi e di eresie nella Venezia del Cinquecento* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1999), 209. For the file of the Inquisition see Venice, ASV, S. U., bu. 40.

numerous drafts, and various finished and unfinished poems, it is considered more of a sketchbook.[27] It is a work in progress, but the content supports the choice of the title *Canzoniere*.

If it is a sketchbook of a *canzoniere*, structural inconsistencies are to be expected. The manuscript contains 126 poems and draft poems, more precisely 127 and 1. Only parts of it were published by Venier, some in a different version, others in anthologies or poem collections, while still others were used on other occasions and perhaps dedicated to friends. The first sixty poems of the manuscript are in a well-developed state, as Bianco has pointed out.[28] They are arranged in a way that suggests they belong together. One logically follows the next, without big spaces between them or other irregularities. Slowly the work progress becomes evident. More and more sketches and drafts follow, including a section of quotations from the *Canzoniere* by Guittone d'Arezzo (34r–v).[29] This does not contradict the idea that the poems were assembled with a particular purpose in mind and arranged in a narrative structure; rather, the contrary seems to have been the case. As can be gathered from the drafts, the poems and unfinished drafts can roughly be subdivided into nine thematic units or phases (c. 1: 5–12, 2: 13–18, 3: 19–36, 4: 37, death of a male character-58, 5: 59–80, 6: 80bbis–91, 7: 92–107, 8: 108–114, 9: 115–126/127). Read in context, they could be a story. The units are introduced by occasional poems, which can be read in the context of the story. A sonnet following C 127 is separated from the other poems by a horizontal line and seems to have been added later. This supports the assumption that the main corpus of the manuscript forms one large narrative unit, so the title *Canzoniere* is retained in the following examination.

Why is the narrative structure important to indicate the possible influence of censorship? Venier's corrections of many of the poems tell much about the direction he tried to follow with his work, where he departed from poetic traditions and models and his reasons for what he did. Many of the poems could be defined as Petrarchist or Bembist; the story that shines through contains Petrarchist themes and imagery and the language is full of Petrarchist characteristics. Other elements could be considered pre-Petrarchan, influenced by the Sweet New Style, Dante and Fra Guittone d'Arezzo. The manuscript shows

27 The numeration of the poems and drafts is based on that suggested by Bianco in her *tesi di dottorato*, ead., *Le rime di Domenico Venier*. Drafts that she did not include are accordingly numerated, e. g. *C* 80bis.

28 Cf. Bianco, 'Quarentena guittoniana in un autografo di Domenico Venier', *Medioevo romanzo*, 32 (2008), 85–115.

29 The origin of the quotations has been identified by Bianco, 'Quarentena guittoniana in un autografo di Domenico Venier', 90.

how he worked with traditional material and models to alter, shape and add. The result is an altered Petrarchist story which seeks proximity to the Catholic faith while experimenting with counter-strategies to create loopholes for a second semantic level, allowing for another meaning. Several aspects point to a Counter-Reformation and censorial influence.

Venier sketches the story of true love ("amor vero"), which aims at the contemplation of the divine. He not only depicts but also emphasizes the idea that a mortal woman is a savior character who accompanies the lover and guides him closer to God. She is referred to as a companion ("scorta") and leader ("duce"). Dante used the word "scorta" in his *Comedy* to describe the roles of Virgil (*Inf*. 12.54) and Beatrice (*Par*. 21.23). Venier endeavors to make the mental and spiritual development more visible, as had Bembo. He is reluctant to apply typical topoi which could arouse the suspicion that the love described was lascivious. He changes the initial flashback of Petrarchist *canzonieri* by suppressing the thoughts of past impure love, accentuating philosophical and religious themes which are picked up later in the story, metaphorized and metrically shaped. Among them are the lover's wish for redemption and his awareness of self-responsibility, the contemplation of female beauty and penance and recognition, that is, self-recognition and the recognition of God.

The poetic treatment of these themes and imagery is striking, if not innovative. Venier employs ideas and poetic strategies which research has until now observed only in spiritual Baroque lyrics of the late sixteenth century by Gabriele Fiamma and Angelo Grillo.[30] To Venier, it was important that penance and recognition did not constitute only the final phase of the story. They were shaped as central characteristics of the lover's spiritual development. This development does not make the lover turn away from his first love to replace it with another. His love is purified so that he finally experiences purged and true love ("amor vero").

What is more, Venier includes true love between two male friends. In so doing he opens up the sixteenth-century Petrarchist *canzoniere* model, as described by Gerhard Regn, for a theme that until that time had not appeared in typical Petrarchist themes.[31] In order to give this same-sex love a suitable shape, Venier borrowed elements from fifteenth-century pastoral poetry inspired by Virgil. He also employed religious themes and language very cautiously. His sketch of the story appears to be an attempt to bring the Petrarchist love concept in line with the Counter-Reformation demands on profane poetry.

30 See Marc Föcking, *Rime sacre und die Genese des barocken Stils* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994).

31 See Regn, *Torquato Tassos zyklische Liebeslyrik* the relevant chapters.

7.2.1 *Embedding the Story and Defining Love*

While the printed micro-canzoniere opens with a typical flashback to past juvenile love,[32] death, redemption and Christian faith determine the lover's thoughts in the *Canzoniere*. The lover looks back on his life and tells his friend, Antonio Giacomo Corso, that although he feels death at hand his time has not yet come.[33] This is an alteration because he does not address the typical love-experienced readership ("voi") but a friend. In addition, the lover remembers the immortal soul of a dead character, his companion ("eterna alma, mia scorta"), who once descended from heaven.[34] This recalls the traditional female savior character of medieval love poetry. The sex of the dead person is not revealed, noteworthy because later in the story characters of both sexes take on the role of a *scorta*.

This soul, the poet explains, knew no fear in life but lived in hope and is now blessed in heaven ("da celesti pensier guidata e scorta"). Such fearlessness in earthly life is attainable only through faith, an indirect suggestion that faith saved this soul. Probably inspired by Bembo's *Rime*,[35] he remembers Christ's martyrdom and its significance to mankind:

> Corso, ben corso er' io per questa corta
> Via de la vita, et con veloce passo
> Giunto a l'uscio di morte al commun passo;
> Ma per me chiusa anchor trovai la porta.
>
> Lieta se'n già l'eterna alma, mia scorta,
> Là donde scese, al suo mortal già lasso
> Dando homai posa in un marmoreo sasso
> Da celesti pensier guidata e scorta.
>
> Né timor di se stessa unqua l'assalse
> Ma spesso, alzata da sicura speme,
> Fin di qua giuso in grembo a dio ne salse.
>
> Ché di nulla, morendo, altri non teme
> S'a lui si volge, il cui martirio valse
> Piú che gli error' di tutto 'l mondo insieme. (*C* 1.1–8, first draft).

32 Frapolli, 35.

33 According to the annotation in the margins, "frater carissimus meus," Corso was a friend of Venier, see Venice, BNM, Marc It. IX, 589 (6795), 11r. On the 'micro-canzoniere', ibid. 37

34 Cf. on Beatrice *Par.* 21.23 (Virgil *Inf.* 21.23).

35 Cf. *B R* 2.6 and *B R* 1 the last tercet.

Opening his *Canzoniere* with an example of Christian life, Venier distances himself from the Petrarchist tradition and gives the story a different direction. At the same time, by bringing into play the lover's wish for redemption and describing his state of waiting, Venier contrasts him with the blessed soul that has already been saved ("ma per me chiusa anchor trovai la porta"). This again nourishes the reader's expectations and gives the impression that the story will continue in a spiritual vein.

Venier's corrections to this sonnet show that he used religious material with caution. For instance, he works on lines 5 and 6, which describe the celestial origin of the dead character's soul. Apparently, Venier thought of replacing the words "l'eterna alma, mia scorta" (5) or "là donde [= dal cielo] scese" (6) with "per cammin dritto." In both cases the new version would have been less conspicuous than the first from the religious point of view. The analogy between the lover and Christ implied by the soul's descent from heaven in verse 6 is erased (cf. John 6:41 and 50–51); an image disappears which would have been censored in love poetry and philosophy twenty years later.[36] There is also a note on verse 8: "da celesti pensier guidata e scorta" which is hardly legible due to the condition of the paper: "La celeste <divi/na> al<. . .>ta." This version contains two adjectives that were also used in religious language, *celeste* and *divino*, and, probably for this reason, they are crossed out.[37]

Since Venier published this poem, the draft manuscript can be compared to a printed version. One version appeared in 1553 in the *Rime* by Antonio Giacomo Corso, the friend addressed in the poem. The print version shows that verses 5 and 6 had been altered; the idea that this soul is eternal and the guide of the lover had been suppressed. In addition, the description of the soul's descent from heaven had been omitted:

> Corso, ben corso, er'io la breve e corta
> Parte della mia vita, e posto il passo
> Già su l'uscio di morte, aggiunto al passo
> Dove nostra natura al fin ne porta.
>
> Ma chiusa in faccia allor mi fu la porta,
> Visto che l'alma il suo mortal già lasso . . . (print version 1553, 1.1–6)

36 Cf. Ch. 5.2.

37 The entire sonnet was again crossed out, likewise the following sonnet addressing Molin. With the same pen stroke the major part of the entire manuscript was crossed out. On this, see below Ch. 7.3.

The theme of sinfulness that Venier avoids mentioning in the proemial sonnet is introduced subsequently in sonnets in which the lover addresses his friend Girolamo Molin (*C* 2–4). The manner in which this is done differs from the Petrarchan and Bembist models. In sonnet *C* 3, Venier employs the Horatian dictum *delectare et prodesse*, but it is not the lover who teaches the readers but his friend Molin. In Venier's story, the lover expresses his wish that his friend should "renew" the merits of the ancient times ("pregio de gli antichi tempi," *C* 3.3) by rebuking human vices ("sgridando i vizi scelerati et empi," *C* 3.7). This wish for renewal might imply the lover's own spiritual renewal, that is to say, purification. Venier finds a way to connect to the lyric tradition without making the lover speak about his past sins.

The description of the lover's personal sins is thus avoided. Vice and sinfulness are instead presented in a more general context, so that details would not awaken uncouth desire. The metaphor of illness ("discacciar questa abbominevol peste," *C* 3.12), so typical of religious and inquisitorial jargon, is used to discuss vice and sin, avoiding an autobiographical interpretation from the 'I' perspective. It could have resulted in the described love sins being attributed to the historical person Venier:

> Molin tu ch'a' dì nostri al ben rivolto
> Com'altri al mal con mille degni esempi
> Rinovi'l pregio de gl'antichi tempi
> Per gran numero d'anni al mondo tolto,
>
> Ond'è che'l nodo a la tua lingua sciolto
> Del suon de le tue note il ciel non empi
> Sgridando i vizi scelerati et empi
> In che'l genere humano è tutto involto.
>
> Già non men ch'operando a te conviensi
> Con quella viva voce, onde si deste
> Ragion ne i ciechi addormentati sensi,
>
> Discacciar questa abbominevol peste
> Che com'hedera a muro a l'alme tiensi
> Tal che san di tal morbo il mondo veste. (*C* 3)

Next, the lover unfolds the topic of recognition and divine wisdom, again through Molin. He brings into play his friend's endeavors in honored studies ("honorati studi," *C* 4.3). Through such studies man seeks to get closer to God

("gloriosa meta," *C* 4.4), but apparently Molin is impeded by Fortune. This is part of Venier's design; he delineates the mental world of the lover in accordance with the Catholic faith, deviating from other poetic love concepts. Usually the love story begins directly after the initial flashback in the proemial sonnet and the protagonist experiences a long development before he is able to convert to a belief in God. Only after the lover's conversion are the ultimate aims of true love, virtue, recognition and wisdom introduced. By contrast, Venier introduces the ultimate aims of human life at the very beginning. The life of this lover is already orientated towards God. Whatever follows, even accounts of sinful desire, is safely placed and framed within a journey towards God right from the start. In addition, the example of Molin's life indirectly explains the lover's story. Like Molin, the lover seeks goodness and is hindered from attaining it by a higher power; he is predestined to fight his sinfulness (*C* 5.1–2) in order to experience God. After this fact is made clear, the foundation of an essentially good 'quest for love' is laid, the actual story of the protagonist's love for the lady.

The beloved lady is introduced in sonnet *C* 5 in an unexpected manner. There are no memories, first encounters or significant dates for falling in love as we find in Petrarch or Dante; rather, Venier dives directly into the story. Love is connected with a longing for redemption and recognition so as to be understood as true love ("amor vero"). In this early stage of the protagonist's spiritual development, love is a negative and sad experience. Key words and imagery borrowed from the medieval tradition of love poetry serve to make this experience more vivid.

The key ("chiave") to the protagonist's life, held in the hand of the lady, is found in the first image; she is believed to have power over his life. The protagonist hopes that his true love will be rewarded with spiritual fruit ("frutto," cf. *C* 79.12) and recompense ("mercede," *C* 5.3). One such reward would be his deliverance from the dungeon of his suffering:

> Donna se di mia vita in man la chiave
> Come vòl mio destin terreste ognihora
> Deh se di vero amor mercede s'have
> Sia tratto homai di questo carcer fuora (*C* 5.1–4)

The lover rejects the idea that death could free his soul from this love, suggesting that he considers this kind of love to be everlasting. This love combines the earthly experience with the spiritual one, significant because the idea of a 'profane' Petrarchist lover longing for a spiritual experience of love surpassing everything that this life can offer was uncommon among Petrarchist poets in

the 1550s. As this love is good but impure and painful, Venier is able to define it as sweet and bitter (*C* 5.6: "asprezza" and *C* 9.1: "amaro"), preserving the Petrarchan model and Catholic paradigm.[38]

The feelings of this lover are in no way transparent; positive perceptions in particular are rarely expressed. He nevertheless manages to evoke a vivid picture of his inner turmoil using imagery and sound. Venier uses traditional love metaphors by having the protagonist imagine love as a battle, a yoke or a fire. Such metaphors were popular religious images far older than medieval love poetry. Their connotations in biblical exegesis and Catholic faith are thus implicit; how they are interpreted depends on the reader.

Venier employs the fire metaphor so frequently that it wears thin. In sonnet *C* 8, the initial longing for death of the proemial sonnet is evoked once again, representing spiritual purification of pain and suffering that the lover experiences because he continues to love in a sinful manner. In order to make this metaphor more expressive, Venier employs sound. Having worked with composers and musicians on musical settings of his lyrics prior to putting together the manuscript, Venier had some experience with the intonation of words and was able to use the protagonist's voice effectively in sonnet *C* 8.

A sombre, sustained 'O' sound accompanied by a soft 'M' sound instantly colors the lover's lamentation: "O *m*ia *m*Orte." The 'O' sound reflects his pain and suffering on the acoustic level and is woven into the penultimate syllable of each verse. It ends each verse, reverberates, and is emphasized and prolonged. Together with the sound, the feeling dominates the general tone of the sonnet. In addition, the 'O' sound is channelled in the key words *foco, poco, more*, and *core*, which recur because the sonnet is based on a circular rhyming scheme. Its structure recalls the form of the *sestina* in which the last word of the last verse of a strophe is intentionally repeated at the end of the first verse of the subsequent strophe. The circular structure reflects the experience of love and the feeling of being imprisoned by love as in a dungeon or prison. This idea is underlined by the repetition of the prefix "ri" in the verbs *rinascere*, *riposare* and *rinovare*:

> O mia morte et mia vita esca del core
> Che struggendosi manca a poco a poco
> Poi si rinova quel fenice in foco
> Et rinasce di quello ond'ei si more

38 Cf. above, 164–5. Cf. Bembo, *Gli Asolani*, 466s, Ruscelli, *Lettura*, 34v.

Né per altra cagion rinasce et more
Che perché sempre si consumi in foco
Né riposi giamai molto né poco
Vivo in sua morte et morto in vita il core

Deh ché non arde anchor tolta al mio core
Parte de la sua fiamma il vostro un poco
Sì ch'una dramma almen n'haveste in core

Ch'una sola favella in voi del foco
Onde questo mio cor rinasce si vive et more
V'accenderia d'inestinguibil foco. (c 8; deletion by Venier; italics are mine)

Lexical meaning, imagery and sound are used to express a deep longing for what could be considered a sinful form of love which poets were not allowed to discuss in detail after the promulgation of the Roman *Index* in 1564. These devices allowed Venier to express the intensity and passion of love without describing it directly. It is no coincidence that such a tight and extensive fusion of imagery and sound characterizes a large number of his poems that concern literal, impure love.

The sound of music became a subject of discussion at the Council of Trent when sacred music, especially polyphony, was discussed. Smooth ("mollis") and profane-like sound was criticized in sacred music and was to be suppressed.[39] Censorial documents on poetry or music scores, however, do not deal with the sound of words, suggesting that sound was not considered in the censorship of text. One could consider whether, aside from aesthetic reasons, the purposeful use of sound in love poetry might have been a writing strategy.

The beauty of the lady was another theme used to illustrate the lover's inner life and the state of his spiritual development. This theme was treated cautiously and introduced after the form and aim of the love had been defined (*C* 6). Unlike Bembo (*B R* 5), Venier did not employ the complete canon of beauty in this early stage of the story. His protagonist emphasizes how outstanding the lady's beauty is and that it surpasses the beauty of all other women as the sun surpasses the stars. Although beauty is the focus, its description is vague.

The lady, beautiful ("bella") and kind ("gentil") (e. g. *C* 6.1), "in cui splende ogni virtù civile / d'antico senno in verd'età novella" (*C* 6.7–8), is "in vista in atti ed in favella dolc'". (*C* 6.10–11, cf. *C* 7.14) Both forms of beauty, the internal

39 See *Concilii Tridentini Actorum*, pars 6, 755 at n. 1.

and external, are addressed, but the description of external beauty seems less important than internal values as it only reflects the actual treasure the lady carries within. The treasure is not yet completely revealed to the lover because it has been recognized only in part.

Ruscelli's explanation of female beauty may be enlightening here. Love leading to unity with God may be inflamed by the things ("cose") created by him. He maintains that the love for a woman is particularly fruitful because the woman is thought to be God's noblest creature and the noblest place ("il luogo più nobile") where God shows himself in the clearest way.[40] Love is defined as a desire for beauty where Platonic and Christian ideas appear to mingle. In Venier, the protagonist's desire for the lady is expected to lead to divine recognition. If the lover tries to recognize the divine, that is, God, in her beauty but can only recognize a small part of it in the early stage, it is because he is not yet ready and the most important part of his spiritual development is yet to come.

Ruscelli's explanation clarifies why the lady, in whom God is always and most present, can take up the role of companion and leader ("scorta" and "duce") of the lover during his development. In following Aristotle and Augustine, Ruscelli points out that a person cannot love what he does not know; he must first know himself, his sinfulness, and God in order to love another person. Whether the lover starts an intimate relationship with the other person or not is of no importance; what counts is the lover's personal development. Ruscelli attempts to distinguish his concept from Neo-Platonic philosophy:

> Conciosia cosa che altro fine non sia quello di tale amante, se non di rimirare et contemplare quella vera bellezza di corpo et d'animo et per quella et con quella levarsi di grado in grado alla contemplatione et conoscenza di Dio. Onde o amato o disamato ch'egli sia dalla donna sua, a lui tutto importa il medesimo.[41]

From this perspective, the protagonist's vague praise of external beauty aims to show that the lover is working on his perception of the divine via this beauty and the extent to which he is able to perceive it. This interpretation may be confirmed in the description of her beauty as sweet ("dolce"). If one understands "sweetness" ("dolcezza") in an intertextual relation to the sweet tears of the Catholic faith as explained by Borromeo, or in reference to the sweetness

40 Ruscelli, 1v, 3v, 8r–9v, 10v, 13r–4r.

41 Ibid. 5r and 36r.

in the wise literature of the Old Testament, then sweetness in this context may represent not simply sensuality but the divine.

Venier reveals the meaning of the contemplation of the lady only after a period of intense self-reflection. A new season ("stagion novella") engages the lover in a confrontation with his senses ("sensi") expressed through dialogue. During this period of self-reflection the lover understands that previously he had hardly recognized the true being of the lady ("mal vidi"), confirming the idea that he is still in the initial phase of his spiritual development and not yet able to fully contemplate and perceive her beauty or the divine. In order to do so he must first be purified. The protagonist's perception of the lady functions as an indication of his development, mirroring his spiritual state ("stato").

7.2.2 *Love and Freedom*

Impure love disturbs the lover's inner peace. It signifies a restriction of his freedom. This is typical not only of the Petrarchist love story but also of the Catholic faith, as Bernhard of Clairvaux explains. Here love is conceived as true love in need of purification, and Venier endeavors to show in the next phase of the story (*C* 13–18) that it is not necessary for the protagonist to renounce his love in order to purify himself and obtain peace and freedom. He increases and accentuates the lover's pain and suffering ("tormenti," "lamenti," "pianti") to further his development. Together with purification, inner freedom and happiness will grow.

The protagonist experiences pain when separated from his beloved. Employing the Petrarchan journey metaphor, Venier has him depart, distancing him from his beloved in *C* 9. The lover is caught up in and dominated by paradoxical feelings of joy and pain which surpass all human experience. They are depicted through the oxymoron of *sweet* and *bitter* in sonnet C 12 (cf. *C* 9) and other contrastive oxymora. The emotional tension rises to the first climax, offering Venier a basis on which to depict the lover in combat with the impurity of his love. This also gives him the opportunity to weave same-sex love into the story and outline the contrast between the two forms of love.

> Cerco donna il mio meglio et seguo il peggio
> Rido et piango in un punto allegro et mesto
> Son vivo et morto addormentato et desto
> Muto parlo odo sordo et cieco veggio
>
> Da la gente schernito altrui dileggio
> Bramo la vita e'l viver m'è molesto

Son pigro et tardo et son veloce et presto
Mobile et fermo et corro insieme et seggio

Duro et molle in me stesso et freddo et caldo
Son et debile et forte infermo et sano
Libero et servo ~~e'l~~ ho'l cor pagato et saldo

Son in ciel son in terra in monte e'n piano
Tutt'ad un tempo et paventoso et baldo
Fuor d'ogni usanza oltr'ogni stile humano. (*C* 12; deletion by Venier)

At war with himself, the lover delves deeper into the question of what exactly causes his pain and suffering.

The next phase opens with an occasional poem that serves as a vivid depiction of the lover's conflict. He bewails the political situation of the Apennine peninsula, which is at war with itself and expecting aid from foreign powers. The poem focuses on the rebellion of Siena, supported by King Charles V, against Henry II (*C* 13). This theme seems to stray from the love story, but it is possible to read the poem in the context of the story. On a semantic level, the conflict between political forces mirrors the lover's inner conflict. With this occasional sonnet and new theme, Venier skillfully introduces the next phase of the story, spiritual development, distinguishing it from the preceding phase and making the structure of the story more transparent. The transition to the theme of love occurs immediately in the next sonnet (*C* 14); the metaphor of war combines with the theme of female beauty, for female beauty is depicted and metaphorized as "arms of love" which have overcome the lover:

L'arco di quelle ciglia a cui son gli occhi
Vostri sopposti, è quel ch'adopra amore,
Né cred'io ch'altre in noi saette scocchi
Ch'i rai che mandan quei duo lumi fore. (*C* 14.1–4)

On this figurative level Venier can now design love as servitude ("servitù," *C* 14.8), from which he is unable to free himself (*C* 15.1–4). To specify the idea of servitude, the lady's hair is added as a motif borrowed from the Petrarchan *Canzoniere* and Sacred Scripture. The lady's hair is imagined as a net in which the lover is caught (*C* 14.7: "così sua rete è'l crin"). According to Föcking, this motif was used by spiritual Petrarchists of the second Cinquecento for the

purpose of modelling a female character similar to Mary Magdalene.[42] Hair as a net symbolizes the lover's lack of freedom. St Paul reminds the Romans that proper servitude is dedicated to God, rendering man free and holy (Rom. 6:16–23).

If Venier applies such intertextual relations to enrich his poetry indirectly with meaning, the question emerges as to whether the protagonist's servitude described in *C* 14 and 15 should be regarded as right or wrong. As the lover is still suffering from love, it could be understood that his servitude springs from 'wrong' love, but after carefully defining the protagonist's love, this interpretation is not very convincing. Another explanation is that the servitude is another allusion to impurity and carnal sensuality that stains the protagonist's good and true love. This interpretation seems to match the description of the lady and her relationship to the protagonist. Remembering the beginning of his love, he explains it metaphorically.

The protagonist imagines his love as a flame ignited by the lady's light; they share the same fire. Since the lady's light originated in the divine, the lover and the divine are now also connected. She is a mediator, as were other feminine figures before her in poetic tradition, as well as the Virgin Mary in the Catholic faith and perhaps the Sophia figure in Gnosticism. This, however, does not mean that the lover had not previously been connected with the divine; his connection had simply been modified so that now his servitude is oriented and dedicated to God. His love cannot only be about carnal desire for a mortal woman; he must break free from the net of his sins to wholly experience the true love he already carries inside him.

How peace and freedom can be found in love is unexpectedly introduced through the example of same-sex love. Sonnet *C* 16 narrates the protagonist's love for a male "you" ("tu"). In him he finds a companion and leader, bringing eternal light to his darkness ("scorta e duce / ne le tenebre mie perpetua luce," *C* 16.2–3), a harbor ("porto," *C* 16.4) and sweet shelter ("dolce rifugio," *C* 16.11). Unlike the lady, the male character responds to his feelings, even returning true love ("amor vero," *C* 16.5), suggesting that the other male character and this form of love can provide the protagonist peace and freedom. Yet, this lover has gone; destiny has taken him away. This same-sex love could perhaps be

42 Föcking, 86.

considered Socratic love ("amor socratico"), as described by Marsilio Ficino[43] and Venier in sonnets *C* 37, 100–102 and 90:

> . . . e del mio Tirsi amato
> sol mi negasti, Amor, quel ch'io non volli (*C* 90.7–8).

It is not clear why Venier extended the Petrarchist system in this way. It may possibly have been due to his wish to demonstrate more clearly, and from another perspective, the moral orientation of the protagonist and to show that his love was good. The relationship with the male character is defined more precisely through the Neo-Platonic idea that the lover lives in the beloved person ("com'io in te vivo in me sei morto," *C* 16.8); the friends, however, or lovers, are separated because of their destiny ("sorte," *C* 16.12). For this reason, the lover's life becomes pungent and bitter ("aspra et amara," *C* 16.14). Even if this form of love is introduced in a more positive light than that of the love for the lady, the reaction of the protagonist casts doubts on its purity. The pain is an indication of sin (*C* 16.13–14) similar to the pain experienced from unfulfilled love for the lady. From the Catholic perspective, this reaction could raise doubts about the moral inclination and sexual orientation of the protagonist and put into question how honest this love is and whether it is to be understood merely as friendship.

This phase of the story closes with an emphasis on this form of love. Venier momentarily returns to the praise of the lady in the subsequent sonnet *C* 17, which was also published in Ruscelli's *Tempio alla divina signora Giovanna d'Aragona* and dedicated to the same woman. He praises her eternal beauty, describes her as angelic and celestial ("donna in terra angelica et celeste," *C* 17.5) and focuses on her wisdom and honesty (*C* 17.1–2). The last word, however, is dedicated to the love of the male friend:

> Chi fia dunque che questa infra le prime
> C'havesse mai chiare amicitie ~~al~~ il mondo,
> Com'un sol tra le stelle esser non stime? (*C* 18.12–14; deletion by Venier)

43 Giovanni Dall'Orto, 'Socratic love as a Disguise for Same-Sex Love in the Italian Renaissance', in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in the Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (eds.) (New York: Haworth Press, 1989), 33–65, 36.

7.2.3 *Contemplation and Enlightenment*

The contemplation of divine beauty distinguishes contemplative love ("amor contemplativo") from honest love ("amor onesto"). Honest love does not pursue the higher aim, as Bembo maintains.[44] Venier may have followed this idea because the next step of the lover's development is contemplation, enabling him to experience a kind of enlightenment.

Contemplation is introduced with two occasional poems (*C* 19 and 20), which were originally dedicated to Pietro Aretino.[45] It seems possible to read the two occasional poems in the context of the protagonist's own spiritual experience of recognition, or as a chiffre. Aretino is first celebrated as a judge of the people and king of kings (*C* 19.9), then secondly for his likeness and art of writing (*C* 20). He is made a subject of contemplation as a picture and true expression of art and nature (*C* 20.1–3; cf. Petrarch, *RVF* 16.14). The sonnets are about the recognition of the true being of Aretino, his ability to judge others and his art. The premise for recognition is contemplation; he must be contemplated in order for his true being to be recognized, just as he is able to recognize and judge others.

The themes of contemplation and recognition are woven into the praise of a lady, and this praise is influenced by the protagonist's contemplation. The lover conceives the lady as a phoenix ("gloriosa alma fenice", *C* 21.1), whereby she is indirectly likened to Christ and Mary. On the one hand the lady-phoenix may be described as glorious because her virtue makes her worthy of glory ("gloria"); on the other hand the protagonist believes that those who truly love her attain spiritual glory. Employing a traditional topos, the protagonist explains that the aspect of the lady makes others "happy" ("felice," *C* 21.4).

Venier comes very close to the sublimation of the lady as savior, which the censors of Petrarch and his imitators would reject two decades later. It is noteworthy that he refrains from employing the word *beatitude*. He also refrains from using the word for the description of earthly experience in all the other poems contained in the manuscript. Venier seems to respect the religious meaning of the word, and possibly Counter-Reformation values and censorship criteria. Instead of *beato*, he uses the adjective *felice*, which seems more neutral and profane. Since *beatitude* was so often described by medieval and Renaissance love poets, it would be strange if the Counter-Reformation played no role here.

The phoenix connotes resurrection, immortality and purification, characteristics of the immortal soul of the lady, which is why the lover speaks of

44 Bembo, *Gli Asolani*, 491–504.

45 Bianco, 'Domenico Venier e l'epitaffio di Pietro Aretino', 115.

the lady's everlasting beauty not being subject to age.[46] Her beauty returns again and again, like a resurrecting phoenix, and with each return her beauty increases. Her inner beauty is at the center. This idea recalls the initial vague description of her beauty in the early stage of the protagonist's spiritual development. This time, unlike in *C* 14, her hair does not symbolize sinfulness when Venier introduces the image of a golden braid ("aurea treccia").

The golden color of the braid recalls Petrarch's Laura/L'auro. Intertextual relations to the Sacred Scriptures suggest that it could be understood allegorically as a reference to the divine. The form of the braid is not described in detail, so it could be in the form of a simple three-strand braid. The three strands could connote trinity:

> Com'in voi gloriosa alma fenice
> Non si perde per gli anni anzi ritorna
> Più che mai bello il bel che sì v'adorna
> Et fa sol de la vista altrui felice
>
> Così l'ardor che'nprima ebbe radice
> Nel mio cor preso all'aurea treccia adorna
> Più che mai vivo ancor meco soggiorna
> Né ~~progresso~~ possanza di tempo indi l'elice (*C* 21.1–8, deletion by Venier)

This is also the right time to accentuate the singularity of her beauty, said to be delicate. Venier first describes the lady's beauty as the highest ("somma bellezza") and then substitutes the adjective *somma* with *rara* to reduce "the highest beauty" to "a rare beauty" ("rara bellezza," *C* 21.10). In religious texts the adjective *sommo* is usually used in reference to God, the highest wisdom ("somma sapienza") and highest good ("sommo ben").[47] If Venier had described her beauty as *somma*, he would have employed a superlative which, from the censorial perspective, might have reduced the possibility of another beauty above the lady's. Compared to "highest," "rare" seems quite weak and does not support the idea of this poem.

Recognition follows contemplation, as announced by Aretino's example. Nothing is uttered directly; everything is veiled in metaphors. The lady's identity is the center of attention. The lover explains that he is not willing to reveal her name:

---

46 On the aging process of the lady in this sonnet that is also part of the 'micro-canzoniere', see Frapolli, 44.

47 Cf. Daniello, *Dante con l'espositione*, 22 and Ruscelli, *Lettura*, 49v.

Madonna i' vò scoprir non già palese
Ma chiusamente il vostro nome altrui (*C* 22.1–2)

He conceals it in an acrostic: Madonna Marina Da Mosto.[48] Because the reader is given the hint that the name is hidden in the text, the search for her identity becomes a game. Within the framework of the love story the game is not only about the name; the name could represent the true being and the divine, which could be discovered by scrutinizing and perhaps contemplating it, as demonstrated in the next sonnet.

The game of identity is continued, but the lover now speaks of the object ("oggetto," *C* 23.3) of his love, not explicitly of the lady. This may or may not be accidental. The word "object" is neutral regarding the sex of the object, and does not necessarily refer to a human being. "Object" is a term used in philosophy and theology as well, where it can be used to refer to the object of spiritual contemplation. If this similarity is intended, an indirect reference is being made to the spiritual background and purpose of the protagonist's experience. The contemplated human female character is not only neutralized or desexualized, she is made secondary because this love is not about her but about the protagonist. Venier is echoing Ruscelli's theory. The object refers to what the contemplated figure carries inside and what the lover desires to recognize: the divine.[49] Even if the lady recedes into the background, the lover's experience is no less passionate.

---

48 The acrostic is again used in *C* 43. Frapolli, 62 at n. 43, points to an edition of Venier's poems: A. Nuovo (ed.), Università di Pavia, 1981–82, in *Archivio della tradizione lirica da Petrarca a Marino*, ed. Quondam (Rome: Lexis Progetti Ed., 1997), in which a certain Marina Da Mosto is a dedicatee. In the incomplete, partially incorrect family tree of the family Da Mosto, Venice, ASV, M. Barbaro, *Arbori die Patritii Veneti*) she could not be found. According to Frapolli, in *C* 29, also contained in the 'micro-canzoniere' (19), another female name comes into play. He suggests to relate lines 7–8: "Com'un ampio e gran mare onde prendeste / voi, donna, il nome un picciol rusceletto" to the Venetian Elena Artusi because, in his view, the surname refers to the nymph Aretusa, 62. However, he does not exclude that Marina is meant. In *C* 48 Venier seems to address his mother: "Dolce m'è ben l'angelica / donna, del cui materno alvo fecondo / che diè ricetto a la mortal mia salma / per nove lune te uscì congiunta a l'alma / l'istessa poscia et venne in luce al mondo." (*C* 48, 1–5). Sonnet *C* 17 was originally dedicated to Giovanna D'Aragona and published in the *Tempio* dedicated to her and the Marchesa del Vasto.

49 Cf. Ruscelli, *Lettura*, 31v, the sonnets *Lungo dal caro e desiato obbietto* and *Non questo mar, c'hor si lamenta e freme* and the elegy *Qual di tante gloriose e sole* of Venier's intimate friend Monsignor Gerolamo Fenaruolo, in id., *Rime* (Venice: Giorgio Angelieri, 1574), 2r, 14r und 11r.

The divine, as an object of contemplation, is vividly expressed through metaphors and symbolism. The lover must praise her beauty again and again because the words Venier is permitted to use do not suffice. He combines several characteristics of the lady's beauty not only from Petrarch's *Canzoniere* but also from the wisdom books of the Old Testament. In addition to the metaphor of light describing her eyes, the sweetness of her beauty and the golden color of her hair, Venier employs other color symbolism, referring to the red and white of Sacred Scripture, particularly the Song of Songs. If one accepts intertextual connections to the canonical texts, these colors could refer to spiritual passion and chastity, while purple ("ostro"; cf. Petrarch, *RVF* 347.4 and Bembo, *B R* 78.8) as well as ruby, ivory and pearl could refer to the divine. This would clarify why, in an earlier version of sonnet *C* 23, Venier described the aspect of the lady as "divine" (*C* 23.2) and then substituted the adjective "divine" with "affectionate" ("amoroso"). It is revealing that red and white describe her mouth and teeth as well as the object of contemplation hidden inside her. Proverbs 2:6 may explain this: "For the Lord gives wisdom and from the mouth comes knowledge and understanding." The lady is the protagonist's spiritual guide and it is made clear at the beginning of the story that he expects knowledge of the divine from his love.

O che bel o che dolce o che soave
O che leggiadro o che ~~divin~~ amoroso aspetto[50]
Corso è quel di colei che per oggetto
Sol d'ogni suo pensiero il mio cor have

O che fronte benigna insieme et grave[51]
Ch'assicura e spaventa in me l'affetto
Come ha d'ostro et d'avorio il viso e'l petto[52]
Questa c'ha di mia vita in man la chiave

Com'è vaga la luce e terso l'oro
De' suoi begli occhi et de le chiome bionde
Come dolci le fiamme e i nodi loro

50 Added above "divino": "amoroso."

51 The first version: "~~Come è lieta sua fronte insieme e grave.~~" Added above "è" "~~ha~~", above "sua": "~~la~~". Another variant in marg.: "~~O che fronte seren.~~"

52 Added above: "Come bianca et vermiglia e 'l viso e 'l petto."

Come ~~bianco et vermiglio~~ è'l bel lavoro[53]
Che fuor mostra la bocca et dentro asconde!
De le perle e i rubin ricco il thesoro! (*C* 23; underlining, deletion, and correction by Venier)

It should be mentioned that purple and pearl are introduced again in sonnet *C* 70 (12–14) where they are objects of the love of worldly goods. In *C* 23, the protagonist has reached a purer and higher spiritual state and criticizes desire for worldly goods. It is possible that purple and pearl add further meaning to the idea that the protagonist tries to contemplate the divine in the lady. This means that at the early stage of sonnet *C* 23 purple and pearl indicate that the lover recognizes something in the lady that directs his attention to higher motives that he is not yet able to fully understand.

Painful experiences help him develop further. Pain is provoked by Marina's departure (*C* 31) and the death of an anonymous male character (*C* 37), who distinguishes himself by honest works ("opre honeste," *C* 37.5). In such moments the lover grows spiritually. It is important that the resulting painful meditation and love are not perceived as sloth ("acedia"), in which the lover loses himself; it would be considered sinful from the Catholic point of view. Like the lovers in Bembo's and Sannazaro's *Rime*, this lover imagines painful love such as martyrdom (*C* 44.62–63; 55.8; 118.14) necessarily accompanying true love, recalling medieval mystic ideas of love and faith. It is no wonder that the lover believes himself to view the lady in a new way and experience rapture when he sees her again. Venier struggles to describe the divine component of the contemplation. He uses religious language and concentrates on shaping a spiritual experience. The lady's face is described as good ("ben") and celestial ("celeste"), and the lover makes clear that his impression is the result of a particularly intense contemplation of her internal beauty which she shares with the angels. From the censorial point of view, a comparison with the angelic nature is problematic, but it is a comparison, not an identification. After all, the manuscript is a sketchbook; Counter-Reformation influence may not have shaped every detail, and not everything that was to be censored some years later would appear here.

Ben è Donna celeste il vostro viso
Poiché qua giù chi ferma gli occhi in esso
Vede l'effige e 'l vero volto espresso
C'hanno gli angioli suso in paradiso.

53 Added above: "d'ostro et d'avorio."

Io qualhor vengo a rimirarvi fiso
Ch'è qualhor posso ~~lass~~ Donna esservi presso[54]
Per maraviglia uscir fuor di me stesso
Convengo e tutto rimaner conquiso

Sola cagion per cui l'arco et la face
Onde mi punge onde m'accende amore
Dolcemente m'impiaga et mi disface

Né se ben mille et mille volte more
Doler se'n deve alcun d'amor ~~suggetto~~ seguace
Pur ch'altramente habbia locato il core (*C* 34; deletion and correction by Venier)

The metaphor of light (*C* 45) signals moments of enlightenment through which the lover is able to approach the divine. It is the lady who, like the ladies of the Three Crowns or "the woman clothed with the sun" of St John's *Revelation*, fills the darkness around her with light (*C* 45.1–4). Venier repeatedly introduces the idea that the protagonist, inflamed by her love, believes himself to be spiritually enlightened and experiencing a new state of love. It is the light emanating from her and the divine that enlightens him, wherefore her depiction as a lady clothed in the sun, including the implication of the intertextual relation, is crucial. The veil is lifted so he can clearly discern her true goodness and perfection and truly love her. He now calls himself a lover of eternal and true happiness ("di eterna et vera gioia amante," *C* 47.11). Since he believes this love to be eternal, he also believes that he can continue this experience in heaven after his death:

L'alto splendor de la mia viva luce
M'alluma tutto et di chiarezza ingombra
Né può nebbia durar ne si vede ombra
De le tenebre mie dov'ella luce[55]

Così la fiamma anchor che seco adduce
M'ardo et m'incendo et d'ogni freddo sgombra
Sì come'l sol ciò che la notte adombra
Rischiara et caldo in ciò tocca induce

54 According to Bianco: "~~bass.~~"

55 Added above "De le tenebre mie dov'": "~~Ne le tenebre han luogo.~~"

Quinci l'oscuro al mio fosco intelletto
~~Tolto~~ et rimosso a la sua vista il velo[56]
Chiaro discerne il ben vero et perfetto[57]

Indi de l'alma il pigro ~~arde~~ et interno gelo[58]
Cangiato in pronto et vivo ardente ~~affetto~~ affetto
L'amo et I' ne godo et più godronne in cielo. (*C* 45.9–14; underlining, deletion, correction by Venier)

Venier formulates his ideas with great care. He does not employ a direct comparison to the afterworld, as one finds in Petrarch's sonnet *RVF* 191. First, he safely places pure love in the context of spiritual contemplation so that it may not be misunderstood as carnal desire. Then he presents it as a part of an experience made in heaven and thereby connects it indirectly to celestial beatitude. This connection defines it as a temporal and earthly beatitude without explicitly referring to it as such.

In the middle of the story, the metaphor of light is extended and the lady and the divine are more closely connected (*C* 60 and 61). The object that the lover wishes to see with the eye of his mind ("con l'occhio del pensiero") is the sun, God, but he does not succeed; his mind is still occupied with earthly things and therefore unable to reach the cosmic sphere. It is blinded by the sun:

Tal s'io con l'occhio del pensiero intento
Miro in quel sole onde sua luce assume
L'altro che posto a par di lui ~~fia~~ fia spento

Quanto più varca oltra ogni human costume
Divin passo celeste in me più sento
Perder la vista in quel soverchio lume (*C* 60.9–14; deletion by Venier)

Venier links this image to a question he poses in sonnet *C* 61 in order to connect it to the lady: Who is able to look directly at the sun (*C* 61.1–4)?

Chi pò fisi tener gli occhi nel *sole*
Senza che resti abbarbagliata e spenta
Dal soverchio splendor la vista intenta
D~~i che~~ D'huom che tanto di sé presumer vòle?

56 Added above "~~Tolto~~": "~~Sgombro~~ Tolto."
57 Added above "discerne": "comprende."
58 Added above "Indi": "Quinci."

Chi pò dir de le rare al mondo ~~suole~~ *e sole*
Vostre virtù ch'insieme ancho non senta
Se pur sue forze a tanta impresa tenta
Mancarli più dov'ha mestier parole (*C* 61.1–8)

Parallel to the question in the first quatrain, Venier inserts another question: Who is able to express the lady's rare virtues in words? (*C* 1.5–8) To stress the greatness of his experience he employs an anaphora ("Chi pò") and epiphora ("sole"). Using this structure Venier connects her virtues to the divine and sublimates them indirectly. The idea of sublimating the lady in this manner corresponds with the lover's difficulty in finding a poetic form to adequately describe her beauty. Whilst at the outset of the story he perceived her beauty vaguely because he was not able to fully recognize it, he developed his spiritual sight to such an extent that he now perceives so many aspects of her beauty that he can hardly describe them.

7.2.4 *Self-Reflection and Anticipated Conversion*

The lover must now concentrate on himself, ponder his sinfulness and change for the better. The recognition of the self is a precondition of the recognition of God from the philosophical and theological perspective. The lover needs to convert. Venier causes this to happen at this point, although in a Petrarchist story it would be considered quite early.

Venier lets the lover begin with a reflection on avarice and desire for material goods in sonnet *C* 62 so that he can face his own similarly oriented inclination in sonnet *C* 63. In following Petrarch (*RVF* 101.12–13), Venier designs the lover's dealing with his inner life as a conflict between the senses, or appetite, and reason, in which reason tries to free itself from the influence of the senses ("sensi," "appetito," "ragion," *C* 63). It is worthwhile mentioning that Venier departs from the chronology of Petrarchist *canzonieri*. Whereas Bembo introduces the protagonist's self-examination only after the loss of the first love ("primo amore") and at the beginning of the second love ("secondo amore"), Venier shapes it as a crucial step towards a new state of love. Furthermore, his protagonist hopes to experience this new state of love for a human being with God's support. Here again Venier differs from Bembo and typical Petrarchist *canzonieri*.

The protagonist recognizes the sinfulness of his way of loving, but he does not deem himself capable of overcoming his appetite ("appetito") on his own. Significantly, this crucial moment of his development is located approximately in the middle of the *canzoniere*. The protagonist turns to God and asks him for grace (*C* 63.11). Such a turning to God is usually identified as a conversion but in typical Petrarchist *canzonieri* it happens towards the end of the

story. Bembo, for instance, designs an invocation of Mary in sonnet *B R* 97 and starts the first *pentimento* section with sonnet *B R* 116 (up to sonnet *B R* 120). Venier's *pentimento* section starts about forty poems earlier. The lover's spiritual development, already fast-paced and well targeted up to this point, is further accelerated.

What is to happen after the conversion? Unlike the lover in Bembo, this lover turns to Christ after the invocation of God because he feels the need to deal with his past sins. His subsequent meditation over penance and Christ's martyrdom, so expressive in its mannerist vividness, seems anything but a usual request for divine support (*C* 64, not Venier's handwriting, like *C* 65–67). Haunted by fear caused by feelings of guilt, the lover focuses on understanding "with the eyes of his mind" ("con quei [gli occhi] della mente," *C* 64.3) the meaning that Christ's work of salvation may have for him.

The structure of the sonnet reflects Christ's significance for the lover. Penance, shame and tears in the first quatrain and second tercet embrace the contemplation of Christ's death, which is recalled in the second quatrain and first tercet. In this way the structure of the sonnet shows how the lover opens himself to the divine message, and receives and interiorizes it. This experience is quite meditative in nature and calls to mind the spiritual exercises of Ignatius of Loyola. In a way it introduces the so-called *Augenkultur* of Baroque lyric poetry.[59]

In the first tercet the lover meditates on Christ's death on the cross, and the revocation of his sins. Venier again departs from early sixteenth-century Petrarchist tradition and he stresses this variation stylistically. First, he employs a conspicuously figurative approach which results in a Baroque-like vividness which he achieves by using the metaphor of blood, which, some years later, was said to have emerged as the "metaphor of the Baroque" in the lyric poetry of Angelo Grillo and Giambattista Marino.[60] Second, he extends the intertextual relationships to canonical and spiritual texts. The first tercet of sonnet *C* 64, for instance, vividly recalls Christ's passion on the cross, describing his sacred veins which gave away his pure blood (*C* 64.9–11). It recalls Heb. 12:1–3, "while keeping our eyes fixed on Jesus," and the words of Clement of Rome which describe the conversion to God as keeping one's eyes fixed on the blood

59 Cf. Föcking on Angelo Grillo, in Föcking, 173.

60 Among other things, Föcking has examined the blood metaphor in the *Pietosi affetti* (1594) of Angelo Grillo and maintained that Grillo introduced this favorite metaphor of Marino, and the Baroque in general ("Lieblingsmetapher Marinos, ja des Barock überhaupt") into spiritual lyric poetry, ibid. 187. As Venier's sketchbook shows, Venier had used this metaphor half a century earlier.

of Christ and considering how precious it is to God, who spread it for our salvation and offered the grace of conversion to the world.[61]

Such vividness intensifies the depiction of the protagonist's meditative experience to emphasize the moment of conversion. The image is so strong that it highlights the difference between this story and the work of Petrarch. This vividness is emphasized by the use of sound working in a subtle manner appropriate for the subject matter: "sacre vene" ("sacred veins") reverberate in "puro sangue" ("pure blood"), the subject of the phrase. In the following two lines Christ's death and the lover's salvation combine through a repeating 'L' sound as in "Lasciasti vòte in su l'acerbo legno" and "lavò mie colpe," sounding as though the lover himself wishes to unite with Christ:

> Grave timor de le mie colpe il ciglio
> Tiemmi e gli occhi del volto a terra chini,
> Ma con quei della mente al ciel supini
> M'ergo a te dio del padre eterno figlio;
>
> Et se tu dico il suo divin consiglio
> Seguendo humil da' propri almi confini
> Giù sceso noi dispersi et peregrini
> Chiamasti in patria da perpetuo esiglio
>
> Se'l puro sangue onde le sacre vene
> Lasciasti vòte in su l'acerbo legno
> Lavò mie colpe a che temer le pene
>
> Poi che già'l cor d'ogni suo fallo indegno
> Mostra piangendo il duol che dentro il tiene
> Ma pentimento ha del fallir men degno. (*C* 64)

Although the lover will soon pray to God to free him from his errors of love (*C* 69.1–4), his repentance addressed in sonnet *C* 65 seems to refer to more than illusions of love. This phase of the story began with reflections upon general desire, and in *C* 65 the lover's faults ("colpe") are not clearly defined and could refer to various aspects of the lover's sinfulness. The sinfulness of love could then be, or function as, a *pars pro toto* of general sinfulness. In this case Venier seems to anticipate a poetic strategy used by Gabriele Fiamma. In order to adjust the Petrarchist model to the Catholic faith in his *Rime sacre*, Fiamma

61 Cf. Clement of Rome, *Epistola ad Corinthios* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994) 81.

designed the protagonist's sadness not as a consequence of disoriented love but as a mundane burning ("mondano ardore") and consequence of concupiscience, from which spring all other sins.[62]

The contemplation of Christ is not fleeting. Before Venier lets it flow into an apostrophy of Molin in *C* 73, the protagonist again expresses his wish to have God work inside of him. Here, rich metaphorical imagery is evoked. The protagonist asks God to introduce his message into his heart like a knife so that it may purify it and "kill" the sins:

> Passi come corltello il sermon vero
> De la tua lingua entro'l mio cor in guisa
> Che da lui resti ogni ~~man~~ mia colpa uccisa
> Et fia mio pro se di tal morte io pèro (*C* 65.1–4; deletion by Venier)

Medical and surgical procedure offer the thematic frame of spiritual purification in these lines. This frame matches contemporary religious imagery of sinfulness and heresy. As shown above, they were often represented as illness and disease. Giustinian and Querini even called Pope Leo X a physician who could cure the faithful. Within this metaphorical framework spiritual purification is imagined as a cure for an ill soul. This image is picked up again and varied slightly in the subsequent sonnets (*C* 66 and 67). Venier translates the soul's suffering into physical suffering. He substitutes religious themes by introducing a mortal character, Doctor Zuanantonio Secco from Venice, who cures the protagonist and receives thanks and praise.[63]

---

62 See Föcking, 76.

63 On the identity of Secco: Only Bianco has so far mentioned Secco, though without determining his identity; see her note on the relevant poems, in Venier, *Rime*. Poems C 66 and 38 suggest that he worked in the medical field and probably was a physician. In the files of the Capi of the Council of Ten dating from the 1550s, I found a document that confirms the existence of a physician called Zuanantonio Secco in Venice. He may have treated Venier's illness. He was granted a printing privilege for his *De balneis* 1553 from the Council of Ten in July and August: "L'infrascritti Eccellentissimi Capi dell'Illustrissimo Consiglio di X, havuta fede dalli Eccellentissimi Riformatori dil Studio di Padova, che nell'opera *De balneis* composta per m. Zuanantonio Secco medico, non vi è cosa alcuna prohibita dalle lezze. Hanno concessa licentia che quella possa essere stampata. Datae die ultimo Julii 1553." signed by Zanandreas Venier and others: ASV, *Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci*, 37r and 39r, 12 August 1553, signed by Marco Zantani and Francesco Venier. The two individuals named Venier belong to another branch of the Venier family, see Venice, ASV, M. Barbaro, *Arbori dei Patritii Veneti*.

This variation of the metaphor of cured illness could simply be a decorative, profane and emphatic extension of the image of divine intervention. It could also be an autobiographical element because Venier himself suffered from poor health during the years he composed the *canzoniere*.[64] All these interpretations accentuate the protagonist's suffering and make it more vivid. Suffering is given a physical substance and shape and in this way becomes more concrete.

Although the conversion to God and the *pentimento* section receive particular attention, this does not imply a negative judgment of the protagonist's love for the lady. It was the love for the lady that enabled the protagonist to grow spiritually and experience his conversion. Having reached this spiritual state, the lover wishes to tell of this experience and share it, but because he is unable or unwilling to do so himself, he turns to his friend Molin for assistance. Earlier the lover had had difficulties finding the right words with which to praise the lady, and probably for this reason asked someone else to do so. Why he chooses Molin is clear from sonnets *C* 2 to *C* 4, where Molin's learning and prophetic poetry are outlined. This time Molin is not only expected to express but also to explain the praise and the experience of love and adjust the high subject to his art (*C* 73.9–10).

7.2.5 *Martyrdom and Deification*

A new phase of the story begins: Seeking deification, the lover has to go through a kind of martyrdom. The reader was well prepared for this concept in the introduction of the contemplation of Christ's Passion. Contemplation (*C* 74.5–6) was designed as a spiritual experience, like love conceived as faith ("fede") so that the theme of love pains could be addressed again in the subsequent phase of the story (*C* 75–91) and further intensified. After the protagonist turns to Christ with his mind's eye, his heart is wounded by Love's metaphoric arrow as it awaits divine purification and is captured by her "sacro almo sembiante di virtù." This martyrdom is designed cautiously yet in a vivid manner. Venier again employs the metaphors of blood and wounds, allowing them to grow like a semantic web. His work on the last tercet of sonnet *C* 76 makes it clear that the common metaphors of arms, arrows and the chains of love binding the protagonist do not suffice; he extends them and substitutes the arrows of love with their effect, namely the blood that issues from the wounds

64 See Serassi's introduction or studies on Venier, passim.

inflicted upon the lover. Likewise, in incomplete sonnet *C* 82,[65] the lover speaks metaphorically of "blood" (*C* 82.7), describing his love wounds.[66]

Unlike the protagonist of Sannazaro's censored *Rime*, this lover does not believe himself to be a second Christ; nevertheless, a certain nearness and similarity is created. In both the opening sonnet and *C* 64, blood and wound metaphors are used to recall Christ's martyrdom. By resuming them in order to describe the protagonist's suffering, a relationship is established between Christ's Passion and the love story, implying an unspoken comparison that indirectly alludes to the deification of the protagonist.

A variation of the blood metaphor is found in the motif of the rose. The rose is full of spiritual meaning and atypical of Petrarchist lyric (*C* 80bis).[67] As the manuscript contains only the first quatrain of poem 80bis, it is difficult to understand the meaning of the planned poem, although it seems that the lover's identity is being revealed. It is Venier himself who is told that roses are born only under thorns and should be plucked in the new season,[68] yet Venier lets the roses fall from his hand, as suggested by lines 3 and 4:

> Rose non son che nate infra le spine
> Venier sien colte alla stagion novella
> Queste che da la man candida e bella
> Lasciate cadersi in su la mensa . . . (*C* 80bis.1–4, draft with last corrections)

---

65 Cf. *C* 83.1–4:
> Sotto il giogo d'amor deppressi stanchi
> Nostro malgrado il collo ambo portiamo
> E da lui punti e stimolati siamo
> Miseri sì che l'habbiam sempre a' fianchi.

66 *C* 82.5–7:
> Quanto il prov'io che di sospir' cocenti
> Vo' l'aria empiendo e'l cor giamai non snodo
> Che tutto piaghe altr'huom non veggio et odo
> Più di me tristo infra l'humani genti
> Above the word "piaghe" Venier adds "sangue," above "tristo": "punto."

67 This quatrain is not in Bianco's edition.

68 Cf. Guittone d'Arezzo, *Canzoniere. I sonetti d'amore del codice laurenziano*, ed. Lino Leonardi (Turin: Einaudi, 1994), sonnet 2, from which Venier took the lines: "intende [2 1] per intendi imperativo / davante la [2 2] non in rima / miso [2 3] / sempre onne stagione [2 5]." On this see Bianco, *Rime di Domenico Venier*. In addition, the sonnet *Nel dolce tempo, a la stagion novella* by Bernardo Cappello, in id., *Rime* (Venice: appresso Domenico et Giovan Battista Guerra, fratelli, 1560).

Profane and sacred allegories and meanings overlap in this quatrain to complement each other. Read from a profane standpoint, Venier the lover ("amante," e.g. *C* 47.11) is reminded of his painful experience of love when told that roses grow only with thorns. The painful experience is inevitably linked to the experience of the pure form of love for which he is striving. At the same time roses born under thorns evoke a Marian symbolism derived from the belief that the first roses of Paradise were thornless and represented the Virgin Mary. Their thorns appeared later as a result of Eve's sin. The thorns may therefore also signify the sinful component of his early love, which led to pain, a necessary component of his spiritual development. The interpretation of the rose as a symbol of Christ's Passion comes into play here because Christ's wounds can be depicted as roses. One can imagine red roses insinuating Christ's Passion and blood even though their color is not described.

The new intertextual relation between the lover's experience and Christ's martyrdom established in *C* 64 and 1 emphasizes the lover's battle with concupiscence and recalls the idea of original sin. The plucking of the rose could now symbolize the beginning of a purer state of love and the next spiritual stage. This theme is continued with the metaphor of the new season ("stagion novella"), which Venier probably borrowed from Bembo or Fra Guittone d'Arezzo. One might ask why the lover ("amante") Venier allows the roses to fall as though he is not ready for the new love and season ("stagion novella") of his life, but the roses fall from a white and beautiful hand onto a "mensa". The word "mensa" could refer to a table, but within the web of religious elements threaded throughout the story it could also mean 'mensa Dei': altarpiece. The question arises as to whether the act of dropping or spreading ("spargendo," first version) the roses on the "mensa" is intended to be a gesture of spiritual confirmation.

In order to bring the lover closer to his aim of recognition and eventually terminate the martyrdom-like phase of enlightenment (e.g. *C* 84, 85, 88, 88bis and 90), the theme of self-reflection is resumed. Since it had previously dealt with the lover's conversion, it was able to be developed and intensified in the next stage. An occasional poem announces the theme on another semantic level (*C* 92), to which the subsequent poems could be linked (*C* 93–96).

In *C* 92 Venier shapes a dialogue between Venetians and Turks. Turks visiting Venice praise the bravery and reason of the republic, depicted allegorically as a chaste young woman. The subsequent poems (*C* 93–96) have remained in fragments and sketches, except *C* 94. They deal with morality and, like the preceding dialogue, with two moral or spiritual positions. Venier translates the lover's swaying between the old, impure form of love and a new, purer form into another semantic field: movement and space.

Perhaps inspired by Petrarch (*RVF* 105) and Bembo (*B R* 55), he chooses the metaphor of dance to describe how the lover moves forwards and backwards ("antica" and "nova usanza" *C* 93). This dance vividly describes how he progresses in his development and then relapses. Venier resumes the form of the dialogue and depicts the lover immersed in a dispute with himself, in which he confronts his mind and heart (*C* 94.2). What is important here is that the subject ("soggetto") of love is a male character, maintaining the theme of same-sex love.

The phase on self-reflection concludes this fragment and remains incomplete. In the second fragment other incomplete phases follow (starting with *C* 97). It seems that Venier either suspended his work or abandoned it. The drafts of the phase on self-reflection show that it lacked a certain thematic variety necessary to bring this particular experience to life. It does not seem to take the protagonist very much further, and so the story cannot progress. It is significant that Venier picks up the theme of self-reflection, as it had been addressed earlier before the conversion with the intention to develop it.

7.2.6 *An Attempt to Speak of Two Loves at the Same Time?*

After a complaint about the unjust distribution of good in the world (*C* 97) and a reflection on past sins (*C* 98) at the outset of the second fragment, Venier again takes up the opposition of same-sex and heterosexual love, allowing him to intensify the experiences of true love and recognition of the lady. He struggles to find linguistic and stylistic means that conform to the Catholic faith.

Unlike in the first fragment, he dedicates an entire series of sonnets (*C* 100–102, incomplete) to same-sex love. It serves to distinguish between the two forms of love. Venier departs from the Petrarchist model, naming the beloved male characters ("amati") after characters of Virgil's *Eclogae*, and lets them fall into the roles of bucolic shepherds. Aside from Tirsi (*C* 102, Virg. *Ecl.* 7), who may be identified with the male figure "quel crudele, ingrato / di tanto amor" of *C* 94 (6–7), Venier introduces Aminta (Virg. *Ecl.* 2; 5; 10), Damone (Virg. *Ecl.* 8) and a boy ("fanciullo") who is not given the name of a shepherd; he remains anonymous.[69]

The use of fictional names is surprising because in the preceding poems Venier mentions the names of historical persons such as Antonio Giacomo

69 On the reception of Virgil in Renaissance Venice, see Craig Kallendorf, 'In the Margins of Virgil: Venetian Renaissance Books in the Bibliotheca Nazionale Marciana and Their Early Readers', in id., *The Virgilian Tradition. Book History and the History of Reading in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007), 179–208. On the censorship of the *Priapeia* and on humanist reluctance to comment on the *Priapeia*: ibid. 191s.

Corso, Girolamo Molin, Ludovico Dolce, Zuanantonio Secco and Marina Da Mosto. Although strange at first glance, there could have been a strategy behind it. The use of the names of shepherds recalls a poetic method characteristic of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries whereby a particular form of love, the *amor socratico*, was shaped after the spiritually sublimated love narrated in Virgil's second *Ecloga*. Historical persons were given names taken from the model.[70] One example is Baldassare Castiglione and Cesare Gonzaga's eclogue *Tirsi*, which might have been known to Venier because it was published together with the *Rime* of his friend Corso in 1553, the same year Venier published sonnet *C* 1.[71] 1553 fell into the early period of Venier's work on his sketchbook, and these poems may be considered as belonging to the later period.

This strategy of masquerade could well have served Venier's purpose. He had difficulties finding a poetic form that adequately expressed relationships with male friends, and may therefore have used Virgil as a moral guarantor. This becomes clear in sonnet *C* 101. The lover addresses a male character named Bernardo, possibly named after a historical figure: "me'l levi o me, ~~per sempre~~ Bernardo, a lui dapresso" (*C* 101.8, deletion by Venier). In another version of the same verse the name is concealed. Venier seems to be looking for an opportunity to substitute the epithet "dolce garzon" (*C* 101.6) known from the Petrarchist apostrophy of Amor. Here, it is used to address a male character, and is a delicate choice:

> Così congiunto al mio fanciullo et esso
> Congiunto a me ne tenga ognihor quel nodo
> Che ne distringe in sì tenace modo
> Che si fa di duo corpi un corpo istesso
>
> Così sempre ~~goder~~ dal ciel mi sia concesso
> Del mio dolce garzon com'hor ne godo

70 On the interpretation of homoerotic lyric poetry of Virgil, see B. Effe, 'Die Homoerotik in der griechischen Bukolik', in T. Stemmler (ed.), *Homoerotische Lyrik*, 6. Kolloquium der Forschungsstelle für europäische Lyrik des Mittelalters (Mannheim 1992), 55–67, 66s; Rictor Norton, *The Homosexual Literary Tradition: An Interpretation* (New York: Revisionist Press, 1974), 143s, William L. Grant, *Neo-Latin Literature and the Pastoral* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965), 117, 381ss. The thesis that the figures stand for historical persons has not yet been unanimously accepted, see Herbert J. Rose, *The Eclogues of Vergil* (Berkeley: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), 71s.

71 Baldassare Castiglione and Cesare Gonzaga, *Stanze pastorali*, con le *Rime* di m. Anton Giacomo Corso (Venice: Aldi eredi, 1553).

Né destin mai fortuna, inganno e frodo[72]
Me'l levi o me ~~per sempre~~ Bernardo a lui dapresso.[73] (*C* 101.1–8)

The corrections:

Così sempre ~~goder~~ dal ciel mi sia concesso
Che goder ne poss'io com'hor ne godo
Né destin mai né sorte inganno e frode
Levi l'un mai da l'altro unqua dappresso. (*C* 101. 5–8, one version)

The corrections indicate that Venier did not refrain from giving the boy an identity but tried using neutral expressions, probably to avoid homosexual implications.

The necessity of concealing the identity of a historical person in a poem, one might object, undermines the concept of a purely spiritual true love. Yet, Venier selects only the names of Virgilian shepherds uninvolved in same-sex love.[74] He may have been seeking a way of protecting his characters and himself from suspicion of sodomy. If he masked historical persons, as Castiglione and Gonzaga had done in *Tirsi*, it might be insightful to consider that Aminta could have represented a contemporary poet. Damon and Tirsi might also have been poets, if one follows intertextual relations to Virgil.[75] Because Tirsi is mentioned in the first fragment and again in sonnet *C* 102 as Damone's lover ("amante"), it is feasible that the name Damone is used as a pseudonym for Venier himself, whose Christian name was Domenico.

Somewhat unexpectedly, Venier introduces corporeality and links it to a kind of passion. This might appear strange in connection with same-sex love which is understood to be pure, but is done in order to underscore its purity. This combination led Venier to moral limits, as evident in sonnet *C* 100 written for Aminta, the first of the three sonnets dedicated to male characters. The stanzas of *C* 100 had been intensely corrected and crossed out, possibly

72 Var. in marg: "ne per sorte e destino inganno e falsa invidia."

73 Var. 1: "Levi l'un mai da l'altro unqua / dapresso." Var. 2: "Lui a me me a lui levi dapresso." Var. 3: "Faccia mai l'un mai a l'altro esser men presso." Variant 4 to 3: "Mai venga l'un a l'altro esser men presso." Variant 5: "Possa mai l'uno all'altro esser men presso."

74 Cf. W. Stroh, '"Musa puerilis." Die Knabenliebe in der klassischen Dichtung der Römer', in Theo Stemmler (ed.), *Homoerotische Lyrik*, 6. Kolloquium der Forschungsstelle für europäische Lyrik des Mittelalters (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1992), 69–87, 79s and 84.

75 On research on Virgil's Corydon and Thirsis, see Rose, 71.

because the poem was loaded with well-known Petrarchist motifs which could raise suspicion about the nature of the love.

The lover explains that the name of the loved character is written and chiselled into the protagonist's heart ("scritto e scolpito in mezzo 'l core," *C* 100.3; cf. Rom. 2:15, 7:23). He wants to explain his love in his verse ("rime"). He describes the light of the appearance of the loved character (6). The lovers are separated from each other (9) and the hyperbolic comparison between the earthly experience and the afterlife is used (11–14). These are stylistic analogies to Petrarchist depictions of heterosexual love through which same-sex love is translated into a poetic system comparable to that of heterosexual love, likening same-sex love to heterosexual love.

This stylistic strategy is plausible when one considers that the lover's capacity for true love was derived from a divine flame ("fiamma"). True love is free of impure feelings and unconnected to the sexes. The protagonist considers same-sex love to be a kind of faith ("fede," *C* 80.9–10) like his love for the lady, yet this love is mutual and both lovers commit to one another.

Venier endeavors to increase the intensity of love in this phase of the story. The fire metaphor is introduced to describe love as an everlasting burning ("perpetuo ardor") and heat ("calor"). This metaphor fits the lover's promise to Aminta not to give himself to anyone else:

> Scrivi dolce mio caro Aminta prego
> Scrivi tu che per man propria d'Amore
> Me se' scritto e scolpito in mezzo 'l core
> Quel ch'a te di mio stato in voci spiego[76]
>
> Scrivi come per fede i' mi ti lego
> D'esser sempr'esca al tuo perpetuo ardore[77]
> Né fia mai che m'abbagli altro splendore[78]
> Ché per darmi a te solo, altrui mi nego. (*C* 100.1–8)

Venier's corrections to the sixth verse "D'esser sempr'esca al tuo perpetuo ardore" demonstrate his attempt to reduce the intensity of this love. First, he thinks of an alternative for the adjective "perpetual" ("perpetuo"), which points to transcendence, and experiments with the more neutral "continuous" ("continuo"). Second, he creates two variants for line 6: "D'arder mai sempre

76 First version: "Quel ch'a te di me stesso in rime spargo."

77 Added above "perpetuo": "contino."

78 Above "abbagli": "infiammi," above: "splendore": "calore."

sol del tuo splendore" and "Di mirar sempre sol del tuo splendore." In the first variant, the word "bait" ("esca") and Aminta's "ardor" ("ardore") are omitted. It is now the lover who burns with love for Aminta's light and splendor ("splendore"). The second variant suppresses the lover's burning, substituting it with a kind of contemplation ("mirar") of Aminta's light. Together with the omission of "bait", these changes reduce the passionate and, perhaps, the erotic aspect of love between the two male characters. However, Venier does not seem satisfied with this solution because there is still another version in which the lover turns around the sun of Aminta's light: "Di girar sempre al sol del tuo splendore." Due to this change Venier is compelled to rewrite the subsequent seventh verse: "Né fia mai che mi abbagli altro splendore." He considers substituting the verb "to blind" ("abbagliare") with "to inflame" ("infiammare") and "splendor" ("splendore") with "heat" ("calore"): "Né fia mai che mi infiammi altro calore." Finally, he underlines the original sixth line and the substituted words of line 7, seeming to consider leaving them as they were. This manuscript does not offer a final version of this sonnet; the poem remains incomplete.

The changes make it clear that Venier first toned down the motif of fire, and at the same time the love between the two men, before abandoning it completely. The fire motif does not appear again in the context of same-sex love, either in this poem or in others of this *canzoniere*. Venier speaks openly of his own sexual inclinations towards the same sex in a poem to his friend Corner passed down to us in another manuscript.[79] For this reason his corrections do not seem to indicate that Venier rejected this form of love; rather, he may have found that the fire metaphor did not serve his purpose in this context because it made same-sex love appear too passionate.

Similar corrections can be observed in the subsequent poem to the *fanciullo* (*C* 101). For instance, Venier seeks to express the closeness of two souls through the union of two bodies:

> Così congiunto al mio fanciullo et esso
> Congiunto a me ne tenga ognihor quel nodo
> Che me distringe in sì tenace modo
> Che si fa di duo corpi un corpo istesso (*C* 101.1–4)

Through the repetition of the parallel participle construction "joined" or "connected to" ("congiunto a") in the second verse, he underlines the reciprocity and depth of the relationship between the two friends. In addition, the intensity of the protagonist's thoughts is increased through the enjambment, which

79 Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 248 (7071), 36r–7r.

links the two participle constructions (*C* 100.1–2). Venier describes this relation through the metaphor of a knot that ties two bodies together, and he emphasizes the stability of this relation through sound by beginning the four subsequent verses with a 'K' sound. This impression is supported by the anaphora in the third and fourth verses ("che") and the word "corpo" that appears twice in verse 4. The dominating 'O' sound, which determines the two verses reflects a strong emotional tension and expresses a passionate desire. Eventually the image of the union of the bodies of the two friends appears in a very erotic light that does not match the love concept narrated in the literal sense. Yet this poem is part of a sketchbook, so it is almost impossible to say why it was written down here. It may well have been an idea which Venier put to paper to develop it later on.

If one is willing to read the poem in the context of the story, the design of the body metaphor may raise the question of whether the literal sense deals with a friendship-like love. It is evident that Venier sought to reconcile love or Petrarchist poetry with good morals and religion, and he addresses this purpose explicitly in the last sonnet of the sonnet series on same-sex love where he has Damone speak to Tirsi to confirm their close bond in the Petrarchist manner as Amor's snares and chains ("lacci e catene," *C* 102.3). He then has God consent to this love:

> Così detto Damone alza la testa
> Et vede 'l ciel ch'a le parole udite
> Benigno arride e'l suo favor li presta (*C* 102.12–14).[80]

Venier introduces the metaphors of "snares" and "chains" that could point to sinfulness if one accepts an intertextual relation to the Old Testament. In this case, a sinful love might be hidden behind the male friendship on the allegorical level of meaning. It is striking that by employing shepherds' names Venier refers to idyllic pastoral poetry and introduces different poetic material into the Petrarchist concept. These poems appear as tranquil episodes or idylls that pop up amidst the troubles of love; they could even form another narrative system embedded in the dominating love story about the protagonist and the ladies. If one reads poems *C* 18, 90, 100–102 literally, they describe what could be understood as pure forms of love from the Catholic point of view: friendship and charity. The concealing of identities, the use of names from Virgilian eclogues, the Petrarchist metaphors and the intensity of the passion, however, raise the suspicion that Venier endeavored to weave another meaning into the

80 Var. for "Benigno": "Cortese."

allegorical structure of the *canzoniere* in order to tell two stories at the same time, one of socially acceptable love and one of a love prohibited by law.

7.2.7 *A New Way of Contemplation and an Untypical End*

The transition from same-sex to heterosexual love leads the protagonist into another development. Complaints about his destiny and love battle with the *donna* get louder, and his wish for delivery ever stronger (*C* 103).[81] Because he has gone a long way on his path of suffering he is now able to better recognize the true essence of the lady and understand her role in his life. This is apparent from a variation of her praise for which Venier found inspiration in the *Canzoniere* by Fra Guittone d'Arezzo.[82]

Although the lady's behavior towards the lover is described as cruel, he understands the piety ("pietà") which underlies this cruelty. By not returning the protagonist's love, she shows herself pious in the Christian sense and provides for his happiness (*C* 105). It is only because of torments and suffering due to unfulfilled love that the protagonist is able to develop spiritually and to experience so much joy ("tal gioia e tanta") of which he does not dare to speak.[83] The praise of the lady is now clearly but carefully intensified. Venier

---

81 *C* 103 recalls sonnet 2 from Guittone's *Canzoniere*, cf. Venier's excerpts from poem 2, in Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 589 (9765), 34r: "intende per intendi imperativo davante la non in rima / miso / sempre onne stagione ben credo la vorresti al tuo servire che non fier per ferisci guerria per guerreggia" and "quella che contra te pone suo senno e suo talento e te guerria."

82 For the design of the *donna* Venier found inspiration in Guittone d'Arezzo for the *donna orgogliosa* that is not common in Petrarchist lyric poetry. This emerges from intertextual references to Guittone's *Canzoniere* and excerpts from his first twenty poems. The love narrated in the first twenty poems especially reveals the inner conflict of the protagonist. Significantly, as Leonardi suggests, the protagonist recognizes to have loved in the wrong manner and goes off in search of the *fin'amour*. Bianco assumes that Venier's interest in Guittone's *Canzoniere* was of a linguistic nature. This could be true, but it should be noted that some of the quoted terms had already been presented by Bembo in his *Volgar lingua*. Venier's excerpts could also suggest that he was highly interested in collecting certain key words such as *canoscenza* [sic], *orgoglio* and *cordoglio* and metaphors with which he could shape the negative attitude of the wise *donna orgogliosa* and the role of the protagonist in his servitude. It might be worth examining whether Venier studied the *Canzoniere* also in terms of style, cf. the excerpts from the first sonnet: *priso priso* [2x] *posanza disianza*. It seems less plausible that the repetition of the participle should indicate linguistic interest. By contrast, it could be evidence of work on an anagram playing with the syllables *is—so—os—is/si*, for instance.

83 Venier's excerpts from Guittone: "spietata donna e fera ora te prenda di me cordoglio poi morir mi vedi / pieta / connel per con lui / aucidi per ancidi / et la tua cera allegra me si

does not refrain from using religious language, going so far as to deify the lady. However, she remains an earthly goddess ("terrestre dea," *C* 105.12), so her divinity is limited to this life. Eventually, she is even reduced to a "saintly" but "earthly Aurora" ("Ecco la santa mia terrestre aurora," *C* 107.1). Venier evidently anticipated that the adjective "saintly" could pose a problem, so it is little wonder that he used the suitable substitute "sweet" ("Ecco la dolce mia terrestre aurora," *C* 107.1). The lady is no longer one of several examples ("esempio") of virtue as in *C* 17:

> O de le belle o de le saggie honeste
> Donne de nostri et degli antichi tempi
> Un de' più chiari et gloriosi esempi (*C* 17.1–3),[84]

She is the only one:

> Dolce amato leggiadro unico esempio
> Di beltà di virtu di cortesia (*C* 105.1–2).

The reward ("mercede") the lover hopes to gain through love or, more precisely, from her, is now also addressed (*C* 107). Venier might have felt challenged by the censorship rule of not mingling the sacred with the profane. He considered changing the fourth verse "Del sommo ben nascendo a noi vien fora" (*C* 107.4) as well. Venier adds the more neutral adjective "true" ("vero") above the adjective "highest" ("sommo"), which describes the "good" ("ben"). One could argue that the expression "sommo ben" could be read in a neutral way and not interpreted as the highest good in the religious sense; in that case the corrections would have been due to aesthetic motives. But, according to Thomas Aquinas, the highest good ("summum bonum") is beatitude.[85]

A similar interpretation of *summum bonum* or *sommo ben/bono* is found in philological commentaries on vernacular poetry. This becomes apparent in Bernardino Daniello's commentary on Dante's *Inferno*. Daniello explains that in *Inferno*, "sommo ben" stands for the recognition of God ("cognition di Dio").[86] Even if the "sommo ben," read from the religious perspective, expresses exactly what the lover desires, such an interpretation would imply the mingling of the

---

renda / fiata <. . .> / guererdon per guiderdon / guerigion / guerigione 2," in Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 589 (9765), 34r. On earthly divinity, cf. etwa *C* 17, 5; 105, 12; 120, 1.

84 The poem was originally dedicated to Giovanna D'Aragona, cf. Serassi.

85 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles*, I, 101, 5.

86 Daniello on *Inferno*, in Daniello, *Dante con l'espositione*, 22.

sacred and profane in the description of a mortal woman. This may well have been a reason for Venier to rewrite the verse.

The protagonist's new way of contemplation is depicted in a particularly vivid manner in sonnet *C* 112, where, as in poem *C* 6, he describes the lady's beauty through the symbolism of the colors red and white:

> Né rubin mai, né perle al mondo credo
> Fur sì candide queste e quei vermigli
> Ch'agguagliasser le rose insieme e i gigli
> Di che sparse le guancie ognihor vi vedo
>
> Così l'ostro, e la neve alhor, ch'io riedo
> Pur a mirar se questa, o quel, ch'io pigli
> Nel suo vermiglio, e nel candor simigli
> Le labra e i denti, in quel mirar m'avedo,
>
> Che ceder denno al bel color natio
> Di quei vivi coralli, e vivo avorio,
> Che formò di sua man Natura e Dio.
>
> Cessi dunque, e s'acquete ogni mormorio,
> Ch'usi troppo vantar lo stato mio,
> Ch'a ragion sì bel viso amar mi glorio: (*C* 112)[87]

Two things spring to mind here: First, the strong emphasis on color insinuates that the lover celebrates his impression and wishes to draw attention to his contemplation; second, he is aware of his recognition and of his new spiritual state ("stato"). He even seems to praise himself because of this pure and new mode of love. This sonnet does not suggest that the lover needs to turn away from his love or beg help from God, as in other Petrarchist stories; he had turned to God long before this experience, and through God had found a pure interpersonal mode of love. Venier lets the lover reflect on the past, a typical element of Petrarchist poetry that he suppressed in the opening sonnet where it was usually placed.

At this stage of the story the lover overtly tells the reader that he had previously loved wrongly (*C* 114) and had not truly perceived and understood ("mal vidi . . ") the lady, her beauty (*C* 114.9–11), her hair ("crin," 7), hand ("mano," 8) or

87 See Ruscelli, *Lettura*, on "bellezza." Ruscelli praises Venier for his description of female beauty.

her divine light ("raggio almo e lucent," 5). Venier emphasizes this recognition by repeating the word "saw" ("vidi") in five instances (*C* 114, 1; 5; 7; 8; 9). In four of these five instances the protagonist admits to having seen her in a wrong way ("mal vidi," 1; 5; 7; 9) in order to clearly define his past errors. Venier teaches the reader by explaining that a means of recognition is a pure mode of love and that this mode of love enables man to experience contemplation.

The subsequent part of the manuscript consists, to a large extent, of incomplete sketches. There are works for an epitaph for Pietro Aretino (*C* 115) and a lament over his death (*C* 117),[88] as well as two versions of another poem on a dead friend who might be Aretino (*C* 116 and 116 bis). They do not need to be connected to the story, since the epitaph seems separated from the subsequent poem by a horizontal line. One should remember, however, that in Bembo's revised edition of his *Rime* of 1548, a section of mourning poems on the death ("in morte") of several persons (*B R* 142–162) precedes the final *pentimento* section (*B R* 163–165) and is thus assigned a particular position in the *Canzoniere*. Even if Venier first wrote the epitaph for another occasion, it is feasible that he planned to work the theme of death into the love story of the *canzoniere*.

Likewise, it is not clear what Venier intended to express in the last poem drafts that conclude the story and consist only of quatrains. In these drafts he employs the bird metaphor. The bird metaphor was known from mystical poetry, Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and Bembo's *Rime* where a bird jumps around in the branches of a tree. In Venier's work, the bird appears to represent the lover's soul, and in a wider sense the soul of man, an undefined "we" ("noi," *C* 125). In addition, Venier uses the motif of the butterfly circling a light from which it catches on fire (*C* 126). Bembo probably inserted the motif of the bird in the first stage of the story (e. g. *B R* 4 and 9) in order to focus on the spiritual aim of the love as early as possible. By contrast, Venier introduces the bird and butterfly at the end of the story in order to emphasize the effect of the lover's reflection upon his past sins.

The incomplete state of this manuscript may raise doubts as to whether Venier had really worked on an entire *canzoniere*. However, the arrangement of the texts shows a logical order in which a story can be identified. At the end of the manuscript, sonnet *C* 127 is followed by only one other poem separated from the preceding one by a horizontal pen-stroke. At first glance one may assume that sonnet *C* 127 is part of the story, yet this sonnet is loaded with religious language, has a somewhat obscure meaning and hardly fits into the concept.

88 On these sketches see Bianco, 'Domenico e l'epitaffio di Pietro Aretino'.

In *C* 127, the protagonist turns to God in an unexpected manner. He feels betrayed by God and at the same time is disappointed with himself and his incapacity to find true faith.[89] The lover suddenly denies a positive outcome of his spiritual development. This is a striking break and makes it difficult to combine this poem with the preceding story. It is possible that the poem is not part of the story, at least not of the story as it was originally planned. It could be the expression of an unforeseen event which interrupted his work on the *canzoniere* project, or perhaps even of a spiritual development within Venier himself. If this is the case, the poem may be autobiographical, raising the question of what other autobiographical details might be present in the story.

7.3 A New Book Project or Censorship?

Two questions remain: What should we make of the numerous deletions of entire poems that concern almost the entire manuscript (Del1), and why did Venier abandon the *canzoniere* project? Throughout the manuscript these deletions occur in the same manner, extending from the bottom left side of the folio to the top of the right side; that is, from the first word of the last verse of each poem to the end of the first verse. In a few cases these deletions were made twice. Several times the pen-strokes left an imprint on the verso of the subsequent folio, leading one to assume that the ink had not dried before the

89 *C* 127 (last version here):

Tu che gli alti secreti in sacre carte
Con sacra penna e con sacrato inchiostro
Scritti, e dal sacro e puro immortal chiostro
Scesi per gratia in questa humana parte,

M'hai con fraude coperto e sì trist'arte
Furato a fin che quanto in lor vien mostro
D'alto poter, ch'adempia il voler nostro,
Possa secondo il tuo desir giovarte,

Non sperar mai di trarne, in tua man giunto
Sì nobil furto, effetto altro che vano,
Come van non saria da te disgiunto;

Tolse a lui sua vertù l'istessa mano
Che rapì'l libro in quello istesso punto,
Né val santa reliquia in cor profano.

page was turned, suggesting that they were written hastily. As the influence of the Counter-Reformation cultural politics and censorship is so evident in this manuscript, another question arises: who crossed out the poems and why?

Up until now there is no source that directly confirms Monica Bianco's thesis that these deletions were used by Venier to indicate poems chosen for a manuscript project of which we have no knowledge.[90] However, since Venier worked as a lay censor and several corrections of his manuscript anticipate what censors would criticize in love poetry some years later, it seems worthwhile to take a closer look at the form of the manuscript.

The manuscript shows at least two different scripts, Venier's and that of another person who diligently inserted various poems into the codex. One reason for this could be that from the 1540s on Venier suffered from an illness, perhaps gout, which impeded his physical mobility.[91] The second script, therefore, may have been that of a person helping Venier with his writing. A document containing a list of Venier's properties appears to have been written in the same hand.[92] As the manuscript was developed over the course of approximately ten years, it is not surprising that it shows the use of different quills and inks; however, this makes it difficult to determine the genesis of the work.

The question of the meaning of the various marks takes us further. As Bianco correctly observes, Venier employed different marks such as numbers, letters and crosses to indicate selected texts. Unfortunately, he never explained his motives for changes or deletions. There are only very brief notes such as annotations above a poem or next to it, indicating that a text was also written somewhere else, chosen for publication or finished somewhere else ("scritto," "da metter in libro," "fu finito"). These annotations do not only indicate a certain diligence but also that Venier left his complete texts unscathed if he did not reject them. One might object that the selection of single poems contradicts the idea that the manuscript is a sketchbook of a *canzoniere* telling an entire story, but we know that at that time a poem could be used and re-used on various occasions. What seems more important is that a narrative basis of a story can be traced in this sketchbook.

---

90 Baldassari and Bianco, 332.

91 Sources generally speak of gout, see Serassi or Feldman. According to the register of deaths of the public health office, Provveditori della Sanità, Venier died from fever: Venice, ASV, Provveditori della Sanità, Necrologio 813, 143r: "Adi 16. Ditto Il Clarissimo m. Domenego Venier d'anni 66 in circostanza da febre già longo tempo. S. Ziminian [bei San Marco]."

92 Venice, ASV, Savi sopra decime, bu. 157, fasc. 6 (1581 adi 27 Zugno, ricevuta per mi Francesco Foscari alli X Savi).

In addition, there are two types of deletions. One type is that described above (Del1). First versions of poems and sometimes corrected versions are marked in this manner which is why it hardly seems plausible that the same method would have been used to mark the selection of works for a new project.[93] These deletions are not explained, and versions that were accepted by Venier are not indicated. A glimpse into autographs of other poets, such as Venier's friend Celio Magno, reveals that Magno crossed out entire poems in a similar way when rejecting them. It is thus plausible that crossed-out poems were accompanied by a new, corrected uncrossed-out version.[94] The second type (Del2) was used to correct or reject a part of a poem. This type concerns single words, verses or stanzas and is accompanied by new versions in the handwriting of Venier or the second person.

Bianco's thesis raises the question as to why in one case the brief annotation "Da metter in libro" is crossed out (Del2) as is the entire poem to which it refers with Del1, whilst in another case only the poem is crossed out with Del1 but not the annotation. For example, poem *C* 74 has the annotation "Da metter in libro," and both the poem and the annotation are crossed out. By contrast poem *C* 71 has the same annotation but only the poem is crossed out, not the annotation. If Venier applied his signs consistently, the annotation and the entire deletion of a poem using Del1 refer to two different publications. In the first case he must have decided to publish the poem and thus added the annotation "Da metter in libro," then reversed his decision, crossed out the annotation, changed his mind again, decided on publication and therefore crossed out the entire poem. As *C* 71 carries the annotation but is crossed out, it would have been chosen for the manuscript and another form of publication.

One might suggest that the annotation "Da metter in libro" and the crossing-out of an annotated poem refer to one and the same publication, but this interpretation would not explain why an annotated poem is not crossed out, as is the case of *C* 70.[95] These are only reflections and an initial attempt to understand what happened to Venier's manuscript. One must not forget that the codex is a sketchbook developed over time; inconsistencies are to be expected. Nevertheless, the three poems do not agree with Bianco's thesis.

What might be helpful to better understand Del1 deletions is by thinking of them in terms of poems which contain expressions and motifs deemed worthy

93 Cf. poems *C* 114, 114bis, 120 and 121 and the opening sonnet *C* 1.

94 Magno, in Venice, BNM, Marc. It. IX, 171 (6092).

95 Cf. the crossed-out sonnet *C* 70 with the annotation: "Da metter in libro" and number "6," Venier, on the same foglio the crossed-out sonnet 71: "Da metter in libro," with the number "9," the crossed-out sonnet 74 with the annotation "~~Da metter in libro~~" without a number.

of censorship and correction in censorial documents on vernacular love poetry in the second half of the sixteenth century.[96] Examples are the opening sonnet and poems of the first phases of the story which describe impure love. Among the crossed-out, incomplete poems are sketches of the lament over the death of Pietro Aretino. Aretino was included in the Roman *Index* in the late 1550s as a prohibited author, and banned authors were not to be praised or depicted in a positive light. Some poems carry the annotation "fu finito" and are crossed out. Such is the case of *C* 72 and *C* 88; both poems describe the protagonist's love pains.

What is striking is that moral and religious poems were left unscathed, as in *C* 70, where the protagonist expresses his disappointment because the lady appreciates worldly goods more than spiritual ones; she could even be read allegorically.[97] Another example is the apostrophe of Molin in *C* 73, in which Venier makes no faux pas in terms of morality or religiosity. The last tercet of the quite moderate praise of the lady (*C* 76) is deleted using Del1. In this tercet the protagonist describes his love pains using the blood metaphor but at the same time praises and sublimates his state, claiming that it exceeds all worldly misery. This is a positive depiction of sins in profane love which is hardly in accordance with the Catholic faith and morals.

Incomplete poems are deleted less often than complete ones. The question arises as to why an incomplete poem finished elsewhere, such as those which carry the annotation "fu finito," should be crossed out with Del1 in order

96 Cf. e.g. Appendix, doc. 1.2–3, 1.1.

97 *C* 70:

Ahi ch'i'non posso far ch'io non mi sdegni
De la viltà del basso animo vostro
Poiché l'oro, l'haver, le perle e l'ostro
Stimate più che gl'immortali ingegni

Questi pon sopra i possessor' de' regni
Por ben vil huom con carta et con inchiostro
Né men qual di più pregio ha'l secol nostro
Far che la gente a lui mirar non degni

Questi di bella honesta accorta et saggia
Far vi posson deforme ed impudica
Et sciocca più che quante il mondo n'haggia

Questi pon far che quanto a voi nemica
Stella contrasta invan contrasti et caggia
Siate lor dunque oltr'a tutt'altro amica.

to mark them as chosen for publication. Among the incomplete poems not crossed out are the rose quatrain (*C* 80bis), the subsequent quatrain, which plays with the metaphor of divine light and the theme of original sin (*C* 81),[98] and the lament over love pains (*C* 82).[99] All three are inconspicuous examples from the moral and religious perspective.

Significantly, other incomplete poems, such as the incomplete series of sonnets *C* 105 to 107 which were not deleted, are not only neutral from the religious perspective but also employ a strong religiously shaped praise of the lady who is likened to the Virgin Mary. They praise "[l']unico esempio" and "santa aurora" of the new season ("stagion novella"). These poems are usable in a religious context, raising the question of whether they were left unmarked because Venier did not deem them good enough for another manuscript project, or because they conformed to censorial regulations.

The manuscript offers little information to account for the deletions of the first type (Del1), but suggests that they served to mark rejected poems. This seems plausible because, from the censorial point of view, Venier's story sought in vain to harmonize the Petrarchist love concept with theology. This concept could not have stood the censorial test after the tightening of censorship regulations in the middle of the century. Venier, entrusted with the censorship of other works in the 1550s, may have realized this as he had worked on his own *canzoniere* during that period. The manuscript was put together during the Council of Trent, the same decade the Roman Inquisition prepared the first official *Index* and Venice issued its second local catalogue of prohibited books. Censorship might have been a reason that Venier refrained from publication if he had completed the *canzoniere* in another manuscript.

It seems worthwhile to verify which of the crossed-out poems were chosen for other manuscript or print publications such as music scores and anthologies. It would also be interesting to know whether they were altered, and if so in what way, in which publication and in what shape. One could also determine whether the crossed-out poems were assessed as heterodox by Venier, his scribe, or a censor who may well have been among Venier's friends.

98 *C* 81, incomplete:
Ciò non sol de la luce onde risplende
Questo sol che la terra intorno gira
Ma de laura medesma onde respira
De la forma d'Adamo indegna il rende.

99 Others are *C* 89; 91; 93; 95 or the poem to the "fanciullo."

Conclusion

The argument that tales, stories, and fairy tales are not read like Christian books could have saved poetry from radical censorship measures, but it did not. The argument was presented by the commissar-general of the Roman Inquisition at the end of the 1550s, yet his stance was not shared by all those responsible for Counter-Reformation censorship. At the beginning of the sixteenth century when universal pre-censorship was decreed at the Fifth Lateran Council under the Florentine Pope Leo X, things appeared different for vernacular profane poetry. At that time poetry was more than mere *favole*, as some leading thinkers of the time considered it a source of knowledge, a kind of theology in which divine truths were hidden.

The Council recognized infected roots in poetry, with the potential to endanger the orthodoxy of the Church. As a consequence, the Roman Church put the production and reception of harmful poetry under control. The reception of poetry, books, and their role in the context of the Church gained more and more importance in Catholic cultural politics, implying an increasing interest in the control of the reading and consumption of poetry with the aim of controlling and forming the public mind through poetry that conformed to the faith.

The Lateran censorship measures had one important root in Florence. At the beginning of the sixteenth century Florence was still the center of humanist studies; the pope had studied there under Marsilio Ficino. It was a place of pioneering humanistic work where the concept of poetry as theology prospered among thinkers such as Pico della Mirandola. The Fifth Lateran Council, however, understood the reception of pagan literature to be partially responsible for the infection of poetry and philosophy. What is more, this infection and the spread of heresy were partially explained by diabolical works believed to endanger the orthodoxy of the Church. The biblical concept of authorship shines through and, combined with demonological ideas, was used to justify censorship and integrate it into the faith.

The devil was accused of seducing authors, including poets, and using them to spread heresies, sins and other ideas that could harm the reader's orthodoxy. Thus, the infection of a text could be represented as a dangerous impurification, which made purification necessary. In this way expurgation became an instrument, a spiritual medicine that was declared indispensible to the Roman Church. A text was said to have an original pure state that had to be restored, implying that the pure version had never been written and had to be found and reconstructed through the Catholic faith. This shows the significance of the

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_009

censor's work for the Church and its salvation. The main purpose of censorship was the protection of both author and reader.

As the concepts of censorship and expurgation are built on the biblical concepts of authorship and demonology, they offer ideas of author and reader which determined censorship and possibly contemporary poetic creation. God, as the author of Sacred Scripture, was said to have used humans as his scribes, while Satan was said to have used humans to produce harmful books to lead men away from God, conveying the idea that authors of sinful texts had free will but had been seduced by the devil. From this follows the idea of the devil's 'co-authorship' of impure books, clarifying why the Roman Church found censorship indispensible, why the reading of harmful books was considered a danger, and why censorship was not only based on material interests in power and authority but also on religious convictions.

Such ideas may have impacted authors. Authors did not only have to cope with the awareness that a censorial authority was watching over the book market but also with the idea that their work could potentially be represented as a product of collaboration with Satan. This may have influenced an author's awareness of being an author and presenting himself as an author in public.

The role of the reader in censorship entailed a kind of censorial reading aesthetic, which was not entirely new. Rhetorical knowledge, especially homiletics, played a role. The censorial authorities were aware of the heterogeneous readership. Often assessments were based on what kind of reader would consume the texts. Sometimes this is explicitly described in the documents. It is nearly always implicit in the criticisms; I therefore suggest that examining the ideas of the imagined reader could be fruitful in the study of censorship. My hypothesis is that, in imagining the potential reader of a text, censors took into account a figure of writing similar to the implied reader. They may not have consciously worked on this poetological level, but in assessing texts and purifying them, they created a figure of the implied reader of Catholic texts.

The *Index*, its laws and related censorial measures reveal strategies and techniques used to make censorship and control more effective. Linguistic precision emerging from French and Roman blacklists draws attention not only to linguistic knowledge among Roman censors, but also to a deeper understanding of rhetoric strategies. The Roman *Index* purposefully employed the word *auctor* rather than *author* or *autor* in reference to the person who created a harmful text. By contrast, the word *author*, derived from "authority", did not identify heretical or heterodox authors. *Auctor* was used in the *Index* to employ the author's name and prohibit his harmful work so that all other texts containing similar elements would likewise be prohibited. A basic mechanism or principle of the *Index* becomes apparent, which I call the 'author principle'.

This principle was also used to prohibit books similar to those listed in the *Index* without explicitly mentioning their titles. Based on the incipit of the *Index* laws, I refer to it as the '*libri omnes* principle.'

The treatment of literary genres was similar where texts pertaining to certain genres and subgenres were prohibited (the 'genre principle'). As the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime* suggests, it seems to have worked as a means of controlling writing. The use of such a strategy reveals knowledge of poetry, and demonstrates an attempt to better organize control in order to make it as effective as possible.

Prohibiting qualities or characteristics of genres meant suppressing, manipulating, and altering them by law. Indirectly, the definition and evolution of a genre was made subject to law. A similar strategy can be identified in the dealing with manners of writing, which later were referred to as 'styles.' The prohibition of Bembo's *Rime* affected all texts that shared the same characteristics. This case set an example for contemporary Petrarchist poets; that style contravened the faith. The *Index* also took into account the authorial intention of the composition of texts of a certain genre or style. Writing about sins on purpose ("ex professo") implied intentional imitation of sinful texts. Censors were familiar with the idea of *imitatio*; one example common in the sixteenth century was the imitation of Petrarchist forms of writing which, from the censorial standpoint, implied sin.

Censors charged by the Roman censorial authorities to assess poetry had knowledge of poetry. Many were astonishingly well read in classical and vernacular poetry and able to penetrate semantic structures. Censorship and expurgation were deemed responsible tasks in the service of God and thus to be fulfilled by men of faith and learning. Wherever possible, adequate personnel were chosen. Guidelines for censorship were found in various sources. It was not enough to consult the *Index* to learn about censorial guidelines, as the *Index* had been composed for the Church. The yardstick for censorship was the Catholic faith. Aside from the *Index* censors could consult the Sacred Scripture, works by the Church Fathers and theological authorities, canon law, medieval inquisitorial handbooks, and new manuals concentrating on various combined topics.

Censorship's impact on poetry is particularly apparent in the general prohibition of books dealing with superstition listed in the *Index*. It had an immense impact on the epic genre concerning marvelous material. Poetry, even if fictitious, was expected to mirror the world as the Counter-Reformation Church believed it to be. The censorship of marvelous elements of poetry was, like all censorship, a question of how something was expressed. Texts not only revealed the mind of the author but could also affect the reader's soul and endanger his or her salvation.

The *Index* signified control of the design of characters such as witches, fays, other human characters with supernatural faculties, supernatural creatures such as angels, demons and superstitious beings such as deities, ghosts and marvelous animals. These and similar characters were to be designed according to the Catholic faith, with faculties and characteristics that they would possess in 'real' life. Witches were persecuted and heretics burned in the name of the faith, requiring witches to be depicted as unfaithful. They were not to be presented as positive characters because they deceived people with enchantments that were illusions created with the devil's help ("mira").

One may call this vision of writing a kind of *imitatio Catholica*. It was meant to offer poets a correct and safe orientation for their work. The imitation of pagan classical authors was considered to be a dangerous undertaking. Christian authors had to 'imitate' pagan models from the Catholic perspective; that is to say they were not to depict superstitious and mythological elements as true but were expected to explain their fictionality. Sacred Scripture and other works on Christian history were to be used faithfully. Poets were to respect the Catholic 'truth.' All elements taken from these sources were to be imitated as described in the sources, not distorted and falsified, meaning a severe restriction of poetic material and instruments.

Consequences for narrative structures resulted inasmuch as fantastic elements that did not conform to the Catholic faith were not tolerated. Stories were examined on the basis of what was thought to represent 'reality' and what was considered invented and fantastic. Censors worked indirectly with narrative structures. If fantastic elements which could not be believed or explained within the Catholic concept of 'reality' were to be avoided in poetry due to censorship, they were suppressed and their development impeded. In examining narrative structures and separating the 'real' from the fantastic, censors used an approach which did not only reveal a certain nearness to ideas on the modern fantastic, which is held to emerge in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the Enlightenment; the *Index* and the censors' notes suggest that the modern fantastic could have emerged long before.

The control of poetry dealing with love was to protect the good morals and the faith (*Index* of 1564, *Rule* VII). Form and content played roles. The use of religious language taken from Sacred Scripture or liturgical texts was considered an abuse. Censors recognized the motive to sublimate profane poetry with the language of the cult, if not God's Word. God's Word was sacred. Religious language had a fixed meaning in the cult. To use it in profane contexts signified the transferral of religious meaning into a profane context, for instance, to ascribe faculties to a profane character or assign him to a position he could not have according to the Catholic faith. In the early stage of Counter-Reformation

censorship, censors were torn between their vision of ideal pure poetry and the awareness that it would be difficult, if not impossible to restrict and control poetic licence. In their view, poets acted and performed in writing by their choice of words. To abuse religious words implied sin, even a mortal sin such as blasphemy. This sin was as real to them as a physical deed. The concept of fiction did not excuse a poet for his sins.

Petrarch's love lyrics were not prohibited but they contained numerous elements that were repudiated and considered non-Catholic. These elements characterized imitations of the Petrarchan model that were prohibited. At center stage was the Petrarchan form of love that was closely connected to the depiction of Laura. Both aspects were a matter of language and idea and regarded good morals and faith. Through religious language and imagery, love was represented as a form of idolatry; mortal women were deified and carnal affects sublimated. Censors recognized patterns of the Catholic faith but also heretical beliefs. They took into account that this was just a form of poetic writing. Autobiographical and fictitious aspects of poetry were considered but did not excuse poets. As with marvelous materials, censors would not excuse such sins.

Such poetry implied another grave error; the widespread idea of love derived from a misunderstanding of its meaning confused with carnal desire. According to this idea a Christian could find his way to God through profane love for a mortal woman. This and other related ideas and elements were criticized in the works of a great number of poets, for they entered the religious dimension and did not conform to the faith. An investigation into relationships between love poetry and mystical and Protestant thoughts was undertaken, as the files suggest.

The censorship of love poetry and *Rule* VII of the *Index* of 1564 concerned methods and concepts of writing, such as forms of Petrarchism. Bembo's *Rime* were added to the *Index* for this reason. During the second half of the sixteenth century Petrarchism declined in Italy while it evolved in other parts of Europe. The reason for this decline may not have been disinterest but rigorous Counter-Reformation cultural politics and censorship.

Writing intimacy was restricted as well. Intimacy, the dealing with the self, thoughts, beliefs, and feelings, was defined as a symptom of modernity in medieval poetry. It meant that poetry described things that were deemed sinful and harmful to the reader. The control of intimacy implied that it should no longer be what it was intended to be; that is, introspection. Censors did not employ the term "intimacy" as they did not speak of Catholic imitation, but the restrictions made by censorship legislation concerned this field of poetry.

If intimacy was described, it was to conform to faith and law and could only be Catholic, either autobiographical or imitated. Thoughts, beliefs and feelings

were to be Catholic or tolerable from the Catholic stance. They should not endanger the reader's soul. This implied a demand to falsify intimacy if the work was made accessible to a reader. Aside from love lyrics, this form of censorship concerned the letter genre, in particular the familiar and love letter, the letter novel as freshly produced by Pasqualigo, and all relating poetic theories. The genesis of a modern characteristic of writing was thus restricted. Such control was not limited to books alone; it likewise concerned man. If the unlimited exploration of the inner life was not allowed in writing, it was not to be part of daily life either.

Laughter at and criticism of the religious and clerics was prohibited, while laughter at and criticism of laypeople was allowed, as well as other immoral content. This form of censorship has repeatedly been considered subjective and arbitrary, a superficial conclusion usually drawn from expurgated poetic works. It does not reflect criteria, motives or obligations of this form of censorship. The censorship of criticisms of the religious and clergy was regulated in a clearer and more severe way than that of the criticism of laypeople.

The foundation of this form of censorship had been laid long before the Counter-Reformation, as medieval canon law shows. As a general rule, disparaging the neighbor was not permitted but the ecclesiastical hierarchy and canon law obliged censorship authorities to protect the good name of the religious, clergy, dignitaries and prelates. Laughter at laypeople could be tolerated for didactic motives in order to educate the reader. Nonetheless, the manner in which something was depicted was important. Language became a crucial aspect of investigation. Censors examined and tried to define criticisms and negative depictions of characters so that they could be better judged. Often concessions were made and poetic licence was tolerated. Such was the case with highly valued poetry, such as *Divina Commedia*. As the files suggest, the sacred poem was prohibited, and it was not cleansed to prevent attacks from the religious, clergy, prelates and popes. Here, political, religious and cultural interests combined.

Comic works containing distorted depictions of historical religious characters were another challenge for censors. Such depictions were to be corrected or erased, for they falsified the 'truth' and implied irreverence towards the faith. Censors were aware that such characters, as well as other religious elements, could represent heterodox ideas hidden in the semantic structure of the text. The comic element of a text was explained as a poetic means of evoking triviality and innocence. By suppressing the religious elements, the hidden contents could be suppressed as well.

The work of poet and lay censor Domenico Venier offers a different perspective on the impact of the Counter-Reformation on literature. Venier worked as a lay censor in the 1550s during the Council of Trent. He put together a manuscript sketchbook of lyric verse, which he left unfinished. In the arrangement

of the poems contained in the sketchbook a story can be identified that is based on the Petrarchist concept yet extended by elements of other medieval love poets.

Venier tells the story of a male protagonist who experiences a form of true love for both female and male characters. However, in accordance with the Petrarchist concept, love for women is impure, resulting in pain and joy, while same-sex love gives the protagonist peace and happiness. Through his love the protagonist experiences a spiritual development that brings him closer to God. The religious element of the story, conversion, is anticipated. Unlike typical Petrarchist *canzonieri*, the lover's conversion occurs in the middle of the sketchbook. Moments of contemplation, recognition and enlightenment are strongly emphasized and intensified by means of occasional poems and stylistic devices such as vivid and strong mannerist and Baroque imagery. After the conversion the protagonist is still preoccupied with his spiritual refinement, dealing with himself, sinfulness and the experience of true love. Dealing with himself leads him to finally recognize himself, the prerequisite for recognizing the lady and, ultimately, God. Venier modifies other typical Petrarchist elements.

Same-sex love is described in a much more elaborate and intense way through Petrarchist and bucolical elements. It is opposed to heterosexual love. The lady's beauty appears to indicate and mirror the progress of the lover's spiritual development. Other typical elements are modified such as the initial flashback on sins. An autobiographical interpretation of the 'I' perspective, implying the accusation of immorality, is thus avoided. Venier cautiously employs religious language and imagery; they are not always suppressed but are rarely used in a profane context. They are adequately used in a religious context, however. Likewise, emotions and affects provoked by the love for other characters are described with rich metaphorical imagery and sound. It seems that explicit verbal descriptions were reduced or avoided, particularly when they could be judged as immoral. This was not only for aesthetic purposes; it was also a strategy for speaking of things that were not expected to be exposed to others. Likewise, the design of same-sex love raises the suspicion that it's inclusion was a counter-strategy to mask a form of love that was prohibited by law.

Venier's sketchbook demonstrates how a poet corrected his love lyrics and tried to adjust them to accord with Counter-Reformation beliefs and values. His corrections show parallels to the censorship of love poetry as practiced twenty years later. Censorship regulations explain why certain corrections were made, and one cannot exclude the idea that Venier practiced self-censorship.

Counter-Reformation censorship did not only suppress and manipulate books, it also influenced the creativity, fantasy, creative freedom and language of authors, and ultimately their awareness of being authors. It also sought to control and influence the reader through the control of the book market; that is, the range of available books and their contents. Poetry was a means of mind control of both author and reader, and it was used as such. It manipulated and to some extent impeded, or suspended, the evolution of literary genres, modes of writing and narrative structures, which would not break free until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries through the Enlightenment. It is undeniable that censorship aimed at and to some extent succeeded in altering literary genres and modes of writing, from the romanzo to intimacy.

Appendices

∵

Editorial Notes

The following transcriptions reproduce manuscript censorship sources from the central censorial authorities now held in the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (ACDF), the Vatican Library (BAV) in Vatican City and the National Library of St Mark's (BNM) in Venice. Documents that have already been published somewhere else are indicated in the bibliographical notes.

The manuscripts pertain to censorship cases which have not been handed down to us in complete files with a final verdict on the outcome of the case, nor reconstructed in research. I have therefore endeavored to reconstruct the cases as far as possible by consulting official and unofficial sources. Some documents are anonymous and undated, possibly due to the author's intention to conceal his identity, yet almost all documents reproduced in this appendix were prepared by censors working for the Roman censorial authorities. Thus, often the reason for anonymity was the way in which they were used and archived. At the Congregation for the Index the documents were read, discussed and sometimes used for comparison or orientation in other censorship cases, such as Barrio's judgments. Some documents were destroyed. For this reason, extensive research was necessary to find missing material in order to determine the provenance, author and date of a document. Envelopes and accompanying letters were useful. In some cases the *Registrum* of the secretary of the Congregation for the Index (*Ind. Diar.*) helped complete missing data.

In regard to the transcription, bibliographical notes and abbreviations have been silently expanded except for titles. Punctuation and capitalization of the original texts have been respected where possible, e.g. where capitals are used by an author to emphasize a word. Accents have been adjusted to modern usage. Where apostrophes were missing, they have been added according to modern usage. Orthographic peculiarities, such as double consonants instead of simple consonants, have been respected. Passages illegible due to the bad condition of the manuscript, for instance, have been recorded as <. . .> as usual.

In regard to the documents, in the sixteenth century there was no fixed form for the *censura*, which could be treated as a text genre. As these documents may show, a *censura* is not intended to list all errors and sins of a text and correct them so that an expurgated print version can be prepared accordingly. The principal intention of a *censura* differs from that of a *castigatio* or *correctio*. In the field of poetry censorship, the *censura* endeavors to point out an author's principal errors and potential dangers for the reader through vivid examples in order to convince its addressees that a prohibition or expurgation is necessary. In a positive case, it confirms that the censored work contains no dangerous material and can be printed as is.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_010

Documents 1: Cases and Judgments

1.1 Sperone Speroni's *Dialogo d'amore*

The anonymous *Avertimento sopra il Dialogo d'amore di m. Sperone Speroni* is part of a long and complex censorship case of Speroni's *Dialoghi*. The *Dialoghi* were prohibited by Constabile's *Aviso* of 22 May 1574, the *Index* of Parma 1580 and *Indexes* of Rome of 1590 and 1593. The Roman *Indexes* declare that the prohibition would be in force until the work was corrected.[1] In a letter to his friend Matteo Macigni dated 9 October 1574, Speroni informs Macigni of his interrogation at the Roman Inquisition by the master of the sacred palace. His interrogator could well have been Constabile, who was appointed to this position in 1573.[2] According to Speroni, the master of the sacred palace informed him that a certain gentleman and friend of the master of the sacred palace ("gentiluomo", "quel suo amico") whose name Speroni never knew had denounced his dialogues and handed them over to the master with his comments. Speroni even refers to the frontispiece of the edition used for the denunciation. Apparently the master of the sacred palace showed him the denounced edition at his interrogation. Speroni says that there was a list of foods written on it and cynically speculates whether the denouncer was a cook.[3]

Speroni was expected to either write an apology or correct and partially rewrite his *Dialoghi* and compose an oration against courtesans. He obeyed and prepared a defence against accusations put forward against him, the *Apologia dei dialogi*, as well as the *Orazione contra le cortigiane*. It is a noteworthy exception that Speroni, an author of literary works, was interrogated in the early 1570s in Rome by Constabile. Poets were rarely interrogated by the Roman censorial authorities in the second half of the sixteenth century, so their accounts are scarce. Montaigne met the master of the sacred palace and his "compaignon," probably his *socius*. Unlike Speroni, Montaigne does not reveal much of his interrogation.

His *Apologia* shows that the interrogation involved fundamental questions on poetics, rhetoric and the freedom of poetry and language. It elucidates Roman censorship politics and may even have influenced it, as shown above. What is more, Speroni bases his argumentation on poetic authorities, especially Petrarch. It is thus feasible that his statements and defence were one

1 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 747, 752, 393, cf. 748–51.

2 Cf. Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, 683, see Pozzi, *Trattatisti* (Milan: Ricciardi, 1978), i, 484–5.

3 See Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, 295, 313, 683; Pozzi, 484s.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_011

reason for the censorial authorities to examine vernacular love poetry more closely in the 1570s.

As we learn from Speroni, this interrogation took place before his *Dialogi* were prohibited by the May *Aviso* of 1574, either in early 1574 or in 1573. He was asked to compose an apology or correct his dialogues and provided for both. He found time for this in his later years in Rome.[4] The anonymous and undated judgment *Avertimento sopra il Dialogo d'amore di m. Sperone Speroni* dates to approximately the early 1570s, and is written by the same hand as the *Avertimento sopra le rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo et del Sannazaro*. The relation between the *Avertimento*, the interrogation and the prohibition is not clear, but analogies between the accusations put forward against the assessed authors become evident. Furthermore, Speroni's apology shows what the master of the sacred palace criticized in his dialogues, and analogies to the *Avertimento* are evident. It is likely that the *Avertimento* preceded and even led to the interrogation, which was followed by the prohibition.

Ten years after the interrogation and Constabile's May prohibition, on 3 February 1584, the Congregation for the Index decided to include the *Dialoghi* in the second class of the *Index*.[5] The *Avertimento*, however, carries a note which was added afterwards by another hand, probably that of the secretary of the Congregation for the Index: "Decretum quod reponendum in prima classe."[6] At some point the Congregation for the Index decreed that Speroni was to be listed in the first class and the "reponendum" suggests this happened after he had been assigned to the second class. Now both he and his dialogues were banned. Three more years passed before the Congregation charged a commission of censors with their expurgation, along with that of Francesco Giorgi's *De Harmonia mundi*, Agostino Steuco's *Cosmopoeia* and Leone Ebreo's *Dialogi d'Amore*. On 10 August 1592 a *Memoriale pro Dialogos Speroni* was read out in the Congregation for the Index, and the Congregation decreed that the master of the sacred palace should provide for the censorship. Fourteen days later this task was delegated to the Jesuit and *consultor* of the

4 See Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, in id., *Opere*, 1740, e.g. 266 and 270–1; cf. *Trattatisti del Cinquecento*, t. 1, ed. Mario Pozzi (Milan: Ricciardi, 1978), 484–5.

5 See 'Alcuni dubbi mandati a Roma intorno ai libri prohibiti con le risposte havute dal R.P. Nostro Sisto da Lucca Domenicano Magister Sacri Palatii che furono lette in Congregatione degli Ill.mi Cardinali sopra l'Indice alli 26 gennaio 1583', in Rotondò, doc. 12/163–171, e.g. 166: "Risposta . . . i Dialoghi dello Speroni sono libri che hanno bisogno di maggior ispurgatione et fra tanto da ritenersi." Cf. Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 14r, also Ind. Prot. A, 23r, entry dated 3 February 1584: "Sperone Speroni e suoi dialogi in secunda classe, ut qui aliquibus est aspersus erroribus praesertim in Dialogo amoris et usurae et multa dicat contra bonos mores."

6 Cf. Appendix, doc. 1.1, 1.2. On the dating see Appendix, introduction to doc. 1.3.

Congregation for the Index R.D. Pomponio Ugonio.[7] The Inquisition of Venice asked the Congregation for the Index to commission the Venetian inquisitor to complete the revision.[8] The Congregation accepted on 11 April 1593 and decreed that the Venetian inquisitor, together with the Jesuit Jacobo Crucio or another member of the Jesuit Order should be charged with the expurgation of the *Dialoghi*.[9]

In a letter dated 2 December 1594, Ingolfo Conte dei Conti of Padua, a relative of Speroni and teacher at the University of Padua,[10] informs Marcantonio Cardinal Colonna, a member of the Congregation for the Index, of the inquisitor's death. Conti explains that the inquisitor had completed the requested revision and left his notes but that there was no concluding judgment. He asks if the inquisitor's "commissar" could take on the expurgation or if it could be entrusted to another person in Venice or Padua.[11] The new edition of the *Dialoghi* was finished by 1596 so Conti was able to have it printed in Rome.

Twenty years passed before the case of Speroni's *Dialoghi* was closed. The new edition of 1596 appeared with a dedication to Cinzio Cardinal Aldobrandini, a nephew of the pope. This dedication contains a striking note. Conti explains that, in the very first edition, several things had not been completed and revised while others had been written licentiously due to the different morals of the time, so Speroni had corrected them himself:

> Bene egli [id est Daniele Barbaro] occorse, che in così frettolosa impressione furno date in luce alcune cose, non in tutto finite, altre non ben reviste, et finalmente altre un poco licentiosamente scritte; colpa di quel secolo, nel quale poche cose parevano poter nascere, che molto non sentissero dell'accerbità de i costumi di quei tempi, ne i quali lui le compuose. Della qual cosa avertito in progresso di tempo il Signor Sperone, alcune di propria mano mutò, altre corresse, altre affatto levò, et finalmente per intieramente appagarsi, ne fece una lunga giustificatione, da lui Apologia nominata; opera per quello che ne dice, chi l'ha veduta

7 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 23r and Ind. Prot. A, congregation of 25 June 1587, Ind. Diar. I, 57r: "Lectum memoriale pro Dialogus Speronis et decretum quod censura tradatur Magistro Sacri Palatii.", Ind. Diar. I, 58v.

8 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. I, 504r–5v.

9 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 67v: "Decretum quod Inquisitori Veneto cum Padre Jacobo Crucio vel alio ex Jesuitis commitatur expurgatio operum D. Speronis imprimendorum."

10 On Ingolfo Conte dei Conti, see Giuseppe Vedova, *Biografia degli scrittori padovani* (Padua: Minerva, 1836), i, 276.

11 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. M, 43r, signed by Ingolfo Conte de Conti.

> sin'hora, non solo degna del suo auttore, ma fra tutte le da lui composte per ogni rispetto riguardevole molto.[12]

The long-winded revision procedure is not mentioned, raising the question of whether it was concealed from the public. It is possible, though hardly plausible, that all the censorial discussions and judgments were considered in the end. The question arises as to where the revised versions prepared by Speroni suddenly came from, but this question must be answered elsewhere. The *Dialoghi* were dedicated to the pope's nephew and published in Rome, requiring a printing privilege from the master of the sacred palace. In the same year, the new Clementine *Index* was promulgated. In order to establish which version was eventually printed, the relating documents must be probed and compared to Speroni's own corrections, the *Avertimento* and the Venetian censorships.[13]

The *Avertimento sopra il Dialogo d'amore di m. Sperone Speroni* is undated and anonymous, but was written by the same hand as the *Avertimento sopra le rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo et del Sannazaro*. The document could thus date from the early 1570s, when the *Avertimento* on the love lyrics was composed, the *Dialoghi* were examined and prohibited and Speroni was interrogated. The *Avertimenti* do not show discoloration, staining, or traces of a seal or folding that would suggest the document had been submitted to the censorial authorities. Although they have been kept separately, the verdict on Speroni at the ACDF and that on the love lyrics at the BAV, in both cases an acompanying letter, a greeting and signature are missing. The criticisms put forward in the *Avertimento* are concisely formulated and well structured. They show that their author was not only familiar with censorship criteria but also with the process of creating written assessments of texts. The author skilfully added

---

12 See the letter of dedication, in *Dialoghi*, di nuovo ricoretti, a' quali sono aggiunti molti altri non più stampati e di più l'apologia de i primi (Venice: Roberto Meietti, 1596).

13 For a comparison between a passage criticized in the *Avertimento* on the basis of the edition of 1542 and the version of 1596 see n. 253. One year before the new edition appeared, on 17 April 1595, the inquisitor of Genoa, Giovan Battista Lanci (once secretary of the Congregation for the Index, Ioannes B. Lanci 1580–1583), wrote to the Congregation on the edition of 1542: "Veggio che in tal Indice non sono molti libri, quali però . . . nelli Indici scritti a mano si trovavano." Among the authors mentioned by Lanci are Anton Francesco Doni, Johannes Tauler, Niccolò Franco, Platina, among the titles e.g. Speroni's *Dialoghi*. See R. Savelli, 'The Censoring of Law Books', in Fragnito, *Censorship, Church und Culture*, 223–53, 248: Savelli has observed that in 1574 Constabile was the first among the Roman censors to deal with Speroni's *Dialoghi* because one of them, the *Dialogo di usura*, "was 'riddled with errors.'" He refers to the *Aviso* dated 22 May 1574, in *ILI*, ix, 747.

bibliographical notes and quotations. As may become evident from a comparison to other documents, this form of censorship of profane literature in the sixteenth century is untypical because tabular lists prevailed.

Moreover, analogies between the *Avvertimenti* on Speroni and love poetry as well as Barrio's censorship of Petrarch's love lyrics are apparent. One could assume that the anonymous author had had access to censorships archived by the Congregation for the Index or the master of the sacred palace and used them for his assessment. The anonymous author might have been within the closer circle of the central censorial authorities, even among the members of the Vatican academy, of which Speroni was a member in the early 1570s.[14] Since the greeting and signature are missing from the *Avertimento*, and the *Diari* of the Congregations for the Index and the Roman Inquisition show no notes on this matter, it is plausible that he was part of the circle around the master of the sacred palace.

In the early 1570s the freshly founded Congregation for the Index worked on the reform of the Index, whereby the master of the sacred palace was entrusted with the censorship and expurgation of vernacular profane literary texts. The Roman Inquisition usually examined more severe cases, among which this form of love poetry was apparently not to be counted, at least not at that time. It gives cause for thought that the *Avertimento* on love lyrics is not part of the holdings of the ACDF but is held at the papal library (BAV), and that there is no indication of the author of the *Avertimento* in Speroni's dialogues although this document is part of the ACDF holdings.

The characteristics of both *Avvertimenti* suggest that Constabile commissioned someone to prepare them. A comparison to letters written by his socius Damiano Rossi da Cento shows that Damiano's handwriting is quite similar to that of the anonymous author, but it does not seem identical. Constabile could have dictated the censorship to a scribe; however, he did not often use a scribe to write official letters but wrote them himself, as sources suggest.[15] His use of a scribe in this case therefore seems unlikely, though not impossible. Yet if the *Avvertimenti* were prepared under Constabile and accepted by him, this would better explain why the *Avertimento* on the dialogues was reused ten years later for the verdict in 1584 and why no new assessment was needed.

In his *Apologia*, Speroni refers to four passages in his dialogue on women's dignity that had been criticized ("quattro luoghi segnati"). He does not make it clear whether he is speaking of a written or a verbal source.[16] The *Avertimento* deals with the *Dialogo d'amore* and concludes with a remark on the *Dialogo dell'usura*. If Speroni had had a written source in mind, it was not

14 Cf. Ch. 2.1, n. 20.

15 See Bologna, Biblioteca comunale dell'Archiginnasio di Bologna, bu. 1860.

16 See Speroni, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, 296.

the *Avertimento*. It is therefore possible that another document on Speroni's dialogues exists which has not yet come to light.

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 355r–v

Decretum quod reponendum in prima classe.

[Anon.], *Avertimento sopra il dialogo d'Amore di m. Sperone Speroni*

In questo primo dialogo ho compreso, che l'Authore s'è affaticato assai, ma molto meglio haverebbe fatto a spendere queste fatiche in qualch'altra cosa più degna d'un animo pio et d'un huomo cristiano: perché qui parla in modo tale, che non può aspettarne da Dio altra retribuzione, che severissimo gastigo. In prima tutto il soggetto è dishonesto et vanissimo, perché non tratta d'altro, che dell'amore d'un innamorato verso la sua innamorata, et questo amor lo descrive tanto acceso, tanto infiammato, tanto penetrato nell'anima a guisa dell'acqua nella spugna, che bisogna che non si pensi, non si parli, et non si faccia altro, che attendere alla innamorata, di modo che sarebbe etiamdio grave peccato un tale amore in un huomo maritato verso la sua consorte: benché qui non accade entrare in questo dubbio, perché chiaramente l'Authore fonda i suoi ragionamenti in amore assolutamente illecito, qual si suppone ch'era quel del Tasso, et della Signora Tullia Cortigiana, interlocutori. Per descriver poi ben bene gli affetti, et gli effetti amorosi d'un innamorato et in presenza, et in absenza della sua innamorata, usa parole tanto vergognose, che sarebbe troppa indecenza a raccontarle. Leggasi il dialogo, a charta 13: Deh se mai vi fece Amor sentire questo suo sommo diletto, etc. Et a charta 28: Ella rise, ella pianse, etc. dove pone quanto sia grande l'amorosa felicità in pensare, et ricordarsi delle cose fra gli innamorati passate; quali con tutto che sieno peccati, et dishonestà, egli però a ciascun passo chiama: gioie, felicità, effetti miracolosi, sommo diletto, bene, del quale niuno altro è maggiore. Oltra di questo non solamente alla ethnica chiama Cupido Dio, et la sua madre santissima et cortesissima Dea, et più volte la divinità di Cupido, ma di più vuole, che Amore habbia fra le leggi, et fra gli huomini il suo tempio, l'altare, et la statua, et che ovunque si truovi sempremai sia cosa divina, et come tale divotamente si debbia adorare dalle persone da bene; et che sia bestemia veramente degna più tosto di pena che di risposta, non riputare, et adorar per Dio Amore. Et benché sottogiunga che gli huomini non deono esser contenti di quella prima divinità d'Amore, la quale è come anchora alle bestie, che consiste nel piacer dei sensi, ma che si deve aspirar più alto a quella divinità d'Amore, che è propria della ragione, nondimeno non intende per questo qualche amor buono, o santo, ma solamente intende, che la ragione anchora sia occupata in questo amor lascivo de gli innamorati, et che s'ingegni l'huomo di pensar, di comporre, et di scriver Sonetti et Canzoni, et cose appertinenti a questo amore: come chiarissimamente

si raccoglie dalle sue parole a charte 30 et 31. Usa poi certe sentenze, et opinioni non buone come a charta 7 dove dice, che non si disdice a gli huomini maritati l'innamorarsi d'un'altra donna, et così anchora alla donna maritata esser innamorata d'un altro huomo; Et a charta 20 dove sono lodate tanto le Cortigiane, id est le Meretrici, che si racconta esser proprio alla donna il viver vita di cortigiana, et che vivere altrimente è violar la natura, et che i costumi cortigianeschi sono via, et scala alla cognitione di Dio, et seguita più a lungo facendo una comparatione perversissima fra le meretrici, et Dio.

Et a charta 22 dove per lodar soverchiamente Titiano pittore, dice, ch'è meglio l'esser dipinto da Titiano, che esser generato dalla natura; Et a charta 26 dove dice che nelle rime del Tasso il nome, le laudi; et le virtù della Signora Tullia, come reliquia in un tabernacolo saranno divotamente adorate da fedeli d'Amore sempre di qui a mill'anni. Et in somma tutto il modo del dire benché assai elaborato, è tanto lontano dalla pieta, ch'io tengo certo ch'un Ethnico haverebbe scritto, et parlato assai più sobriamente, che non fa questo nostro maestro d'Amore. Io ho trascorso questo primo dialogo con grandissimo mio dispiacere, et repugnanza, et senz'andar più innanzi, qui farò fine, perché mi basta assai haver conosciuto il leone dall'unghie. Et ho questo parere, che togliendosi via tutto il libro, et tutte queste fatiche, il mondo non resterà per questo niente manco perfetto, et non perderà cosa che buona sia, ma si bene si leverà dal christianesimo cosa di scandalo, et di vergogna.

Tractatus eiusdem libri de usura: usuram defendit et laudat tunque honestissimum benevolentiae effectum.[17]

1.2 Poetry by Ariosto, Sannazaro and Bembo (*Avertimento*)

On the author, provenance and dating of this document see the introductions to 1.1 and 1.3.[18]

17 This annotation was made by another hand.

18 The introduction to this censorship has been published several times, for instance in Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, 163s and in Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, doc. III, 72. I found an edition of Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and *Rime* in the ACDF 1556, published in Venice by Gabriel Giolito, with a dedication to Giulio Martinengo and edited by Tommaso Porcacchi. The frontispiece of the edition is missing. Frontispieces were sometimes used for denouncements and, in such case, removed. My thanks go to Daniel Ponziani, archivist at ACDF, for this information. For the censorship of Bembo's *Rime* the censors used the edition prepared and commented on by Sansovino (Venice: Sansovino, 1561).

Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, 59r–61r

1.2a The Censor's Introduction to Poetry

[Anon.], *Avertimento sopra le rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo et del Sannazaro*

È cosa ordinaria et quasi comune a tutti i Poeti volgari di lodar tanto soverchiamente la lor Donna, che se non la fanno un Dio, non gli pare haver fatto niente: Et di qui è che usano di dire spessissime volte. Io v'adoro, voi siete la mia Dea, il mio Idolo: Voi sola mi potete far beato. Et più innanzi anchora trascorrono tanto in attribuirle gli effetti della divinità, che non si contentano di dire, ch'all'apparir suo s'acquetino i venti, si plachi il mare, si partano le nuvole, s'infiori la terra et si rassereni il cielo, ma espressamente dicono, ch'è sì grande la gioia che sentono per lei, che non è maggiore quella del paradiso: et per lo contrario la pena esser tanta, che quella dell'Inferno non se le può agguagliare. Le quali tutte sono biasteme horrende, et quantunque fossero dette per gioco, et per trastullo, non resta per questo che non siano peccati mortali gravissimi.

Oltra di questo hanno per costume d'attribuir sempre ogni loro vanità al cielo, alle stelle, al fato, al destino: di modo che se essi errano, dicono essere sforzati a così fare, et ch'è più colpa del cielo, et del destino, che sua: Et per questo molte volte chiamano le stelle fiere, i fati iniqui, et crudeli. Che sono tutte certe loro sciocchezze piene d'errori.

Sono anchora, o si fingono tanto attaccati alle volte alle cose d'Amore, che non fanno altro, che lodare amore, et procedono tanto innanzi, che tengono ogn'altr'huomo privo di giudicio, et d'ingegno, et da poco a fatto, se non seguiti quella medesima strada, che essi seguono, et che essi tanto apprezzano.

In particolar poi, dove ciascuno di questi tre Poeti habbia errato oltra le cose sopradette, sarà notato nel foglio seguente.

1.2b Ariosto's Rime

Rime dell'Ariosto

Il primo numero significa la charta, il secondo la faccia, il terzo la linea.

4.1.14. Di ch'esser mi credea ricco, et beato.
5.1.28. Beò con gli occhi il foco, l'aer, et l'acque.
30. Con il ciel di par contende.
32. Ma beato chi vita da quel prende.
6.1.28. Chi mi prese adoro.
17.2.9. Che la mia mente pur non la comprende
perch'ella è com'un Dio.

31. Ne la quale io comprendo
quell'alme gratie, che nel cielo attendo.

18.2.6.

29.1.8. La mia Dea.

37.2.9.

7.1.5. Credendo poi che più potesse l'uso
che 'l destin.

11.1.12. Ma più che giusta elettione, il mio
fiero destin ho da imputar, s'io fallo.

37.2. Tutto il Capitolo Decimo quinto, dove biasima
chi non è innamorato.

Usa poi troppa licenza in raccontar le dishonestà alla scoperta.

10.1.27. Ma benigne accoglienze . . .

28.2. Tutto il Capitolo Sesto.

Dice anchora una sentenza pessima.

27.1. in fine. O di noi più non curano, o non hanno
Qua giù più forza, o degli nostri casi
Quei che reggono il ciel giù poco sanno.
Che non vi siano anchor crederei quasi . . .

1.2c Bembo's *Rime* (with *Stanze*)

Rime del Bembo.

6.2.15. Egli ha in sua mano
Nostra vita, né pote altro salvarne.

14.1.8. Che sì come virtù da lei procede
Che'l tempra, et regge, et com' è sol beato
A cui per gratia il contemplarla e dato
Et essa è d'ogni affanno ampia mercede.
Così 'l sostegno mio da voi ne vene,

[Od in atti cortesi; od in parole:]
Et sol felice sono quand' io vi miro.
21.1.6. Dolce mia vaga angelica beatrice.
24.2.11. Su nel ciel non è spirto sì beato
Con ch'io cangiassi il mio felice stato.
18. Non si proua o sente
Pena giù nel dolente
Cerchio di Stige, e in quello eterno foco,
Che posta col mio mal non fosse un gioco.
25.1.15. La dolce vista angelica beatrice
De la mia vita, et d'ogni ben radice.
27.2.3. Mostrommi entro a lo spatio d'un bel volto
Amor quanto può darne il ciel raccolto
34.1.6. Questo ingegno
Vi sacro, et questa mano, et questa mente.
53.1.24. Et che del sommo ben colui si priva
Ch'al natural diletto indura il core.
58.2. in fine. Et s'huom durasse molto in tale stato
Compitamente diverria beato.

7.2.2. Fatal mio vivo lume.
12.1.21. La mia fatal nemica.
14.1.6. Dispose ch'io v'amassi, et dielmi in fato.
34.2.17. Ma piè mosso dal ciel nulla distorna.
35.2.15. Lasso, ben veggio homai, si com'è duro
Fuggir quel che di noi su nel ciel piacque,
Né pote huom dal suo fato esser mai lungi.
23. Poi piacque al ciel, cui contrastar non vale.
38.2. in fine. Fatale, et pretioso mio ritegno.

Seguitano le Rime del Bembo

53.1. in fine. Et sopra tutto come gran peccato,
Commette chi non ama essendo amato.
54.1.23. Dando lor' a veder quanto s'inganni
Chi non mi dona il fior de' suoi verdi anni.
57.1. Per tutta quella faccia
58.2.17. Puossi morta chiamar quella, di cui
Pace d'amor nessun piacere accende.

1.2d Bembo's *Stanze*

Mescola poi le cose sante con le profane, et usa sentenze false contra la fede, benché in una mascherata.

53.1.14. Han posto più d'un tempio, et fan lor voti
Sopra l'offese de' suoi dolci strali,
Et mille a prova eletti sacerdoti
Curan le cose sante, et spirituali.
2.2. Honoran la lor Dea con pura fede.
57.2.1. Il pregio d'honestate, amato et colto
Da quelle antiche poste in prosa, e'n rima
Et li voci, ch'l volgo errante, et stolto
Di peccato, et disnor sì grave estima,
Son foli di romanzi, et sogno, et ombra
Che l'alme semplicette preme, e'ngombra.
in fine. Né voi peccate
Quando il piacer, per cui si nasce, amate

1.2e Sannazaro's *Rime*

Rime del Sannazaro

9.1. in fine. Un che mi strugge, un che m'uccide adoro
Et per lui vivo, et moro
Né pur dal cieco, et folle desir mio,
Ma da l'ingordo mondo è fatto Dio.
13.2.11. Mia Dea.
29.1.19. Quella sua Dea.
31.1.22. L'alma mia Dea dal ciel discese.
15.2.5. Di quei begli occhi, ov'io mirando fiso
sento, qual sia 'l piacer del paradiso.
17.1. 4. Il mio cor beasti.
24.1.16. Farme morendo uscir da quest'inferno
2.12. Che così vaga in ciel mi riconduce
Et mi fa degno de' superni scanni.
28.1. 1. Qual pena (lasso) è sì spietata, et cruda
Giù nel gran pianto eterno

Via maggior non la senta l'alma stanca?
La qual dannata in questo vivo inferno
Trema nel foco ignuda.

29.2.2. Canzon mia mai nel cielo
~~Non fui~~ Tra' li beati spirti
Non fui, ma vo' ben dirti
Che'l fonte, ond'esce sì perpetua noia,
Trapassa ogn'altra gioia.

21.1.21. Se per colpa del vostro fiero sdegno
Il dolor che m'afflige,
Madonna, mi trasporta all'altra Stige,
Non havrò duol del mio supplicio indegno
Né de l'eterno foco
Ma di voi, che verrete a simil loco:
Perché sovente in voi mirando fiso,
Per virtù del bel viso
Pena non fia la giù, che'l cor tocchi:
Solo un tormento havrò di chiuder gli occhi.

Seguitano le rime del Sannazaro

2.1.8. Da mia stella
Tirar ver me ti sento.

13. Poi ch'al ciel piacqui.

27.2.3. Ahi fera stella

12.1.16. O fere stelle homai datemi pace.

15.1.34. Sì mi governa Amor, Fortuna, e'l Cielo

2.14. Invide stelle

19.1.9. A cui le stelle, Amor, Fortuna, e'l fato
diedero in sorte questo sconsolato.

2.9. Ahi sorte, ahi crudel fato.

24.1.12. Ma 'l ciel, ch'ogni mio ben sempre hebbe a scherno.

27.2.27. Del viver mio l'augurio il ciel mi diede.

29.1.11. Ahi stelle, ahi fati del mio ben sì scarsi.

31.1.11. Pur c'habbia fin mio fato acerbo et rio
usin le stelle, e'l ciel tutte lor prove.

30. Dunque era pur nel fato acerbo, et crudo.

Usa poi sentenze pessime.

6.2.20. Così va 'l mondo o fere, et crude stelle?
Così giustitia il ciel governa, et regge?
Quest'è 'l decreto de l'immota legge? . . .
30.1.8. Qual nuova invidia è nata in paradiso?
17. Tante ire son ne gli animi celesti?

Mescola le cose profane con le sacre.

10.1.20. Tu le mie tempie ornasti (ahi fiero pegno)
Di quelle horride punte, che fer pria
Diadema al Vincitor del sacro legno.
35.2.20. Se pur vera humiltà Madonna homai
Vi risospigne a dir le colpe antiche . . .

1.2f Comments by Sansovino and Others

Nelle cose aggiunte da Francesco Sansovino, et da altri, sono da avertire le cose infrascritte.

Sopra l'Ariosto.

5.2.20. Fu Fiorentina, et de' Lapi, et era vedova.
50.2.8. Vi consacra hoggi il mondo altari, et tempi.
51.2.5. Vi consacra hoggi il mondo in bronzi, in marmi
Idoli, et tempi a gloria sempiterna.

Sopra il Bembo

27.2.18. Tratta de l'amor divino alla Platonica.

Sopra il Sannazaro.

Nella Vita del Sannazaro.

in fine. Io mi partirò di questa vita assai lieto . . .
35.2.17. Dovendosi la sua Donna confessare.

45.1.9. Le figure, i bei scritti, et l'alte note,
Vaghe, eterni, et soavi apre, et dispriega
A gli angeli beati, a l'alme sante
In cotai guise in fin la suso ignote . . .
2.7. Gli occhi, i pensier, l'orecchie ella nodriva
Di pari obietti, et d'armonia simile
In tutto a quel, che la bell'alma humile
Ode, e intende, et contempla fatta diva.
Hor empie'l ciel di sì novi concenti . . .

1.3 Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto, Sannazaro and Bembo (Barrio)

A fascicle of anonymous censorship documents of the manuscript codex BAV, Vat. Lat. 6149 contains judgments on Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, Dante's *Divina Commedia*, Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*, Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and *De partu Virginis* and Bembo's *Rime*. This fascicle is followed by another one which contains only a copy on the judgment on Petrarch, with a new introduction and slight changes, and on Dante.[19] Both fascicles are archived with censorships written roughly ten years later. The first fascicle is archived with a judgment on Johannes Drusius, the second is archived with a judgment on Johannes Tauler.[20] Furthermore, the codex contains materials on manicheism and the *Index*, for instance.

Except Bembo's *Rime* and perhaps Ariosto's *Furioso*, these works are not known for being of great interest to the Roman censorial authorities. Only a few poems of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi* were put on the Roman *Indexes*.[21]

19 The document contains an introduction, 142r, a judgment on Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, 142r–4v, Dante's *Divina Commedia*, 144v–5r, Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*, 146r–v, Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and *De partu Virginis*, 146v, a copy of the judgment on Petrarch, 148r–9v and Dante's *Divina Commedia*, 149v–50r. The judgments on Petrarch have been published by Passarelli; the bibliographical references to the censored lines are taken from her. Her transcription differs from mine, so I decided to publish the judgments again. The censorships of Ariosto and Sannazaro are reproduced in Passarelli as well, with a French translation in Deramaix, and a German translation of the judgments on Petrarch, Dante and Ariosto appears in Godman, *Weltliteratur auf dem Index. Die geheimen Gutachten des Vatikans* (Berlin: Propyläen: 2001).

20 On 139r begins *In libros XII observationes Joannis Drusii Andtwerpiae '84* (to 140v), from 141r–5r, 146r–v follow Barrio's censorships. The recto of the next folio is blank [should be 147r] and [147v] and the cover page of the censorship of Drusius (146v) concludes the fascicle. The second fascicle with Barrio's censorships begins on 147r, ends on 150v and is inserted into *Censura Joannnis Tauleri Dogmata* (147r and 150v, cover page, double pagination). Passarelli makes no mention of these documents, cf. ead., 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.

21 Cf. *ILI*, viii.

As explained above, these poems were banned through the prohibition of Vergerio's book and through the general prohibitions of the *Index*. The prohibition of Vergerio's book implied that some of Petrarch's Latin letters reproduced in it were not permitted: "Petrarchae Epistolarum loca quaedam traducta. Vide Liber inscriptus, Alcuni importanti luoghi."[22] The *Index* of Parma of 1580 bans sonnets *RVF* 136, 137 and 138 in its section of music scores (*Libri de Musica*), which does not mean that the ban concerned only music scores. It signifies the prohibition of the already banned sonnets no matter in what shape they circulated, and thus reinforces and specifies the prior prohibition. The Roman *Index* of 1590 and 1593 prohibit Petrarch's sonnets *RVF* 114, 136, 137 and 138.[23]

Sannazaro's works *Arcadia* and *De partu Virginis* do not appear on the Roman *Indexes* or blacklists of the second half of the sixteenth century. Bembo's case has been discussed above in Chapter 3.3, Dante's in Chapter 6.3 and the case of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* in my introduction to documents 1.4–5.

These anonymous censorships were rightly attributed to Gabriele Barrio by Maria Antonietta Passarelli.[24] The author's introduction to the censorships (1.3a) corroborates her thesis because it refers to his book *Pro lingua latina*, first published in 1554, with a *motu proprio* by Pope Julius III. As shown above, his book contains assessments of the same and other poets. A comparison between the judgments in *Pro lingua latina* and the censorships shows that Barrio reused the former for his censorships, although he added quotations from the censored texts and expanded his discussion of problems and dangers.

Interestingly, Barrio's criticisms are in Latin, but his quotations from the examined works by Petrarch and Dante are in the vernacular. Passarelli identified traces of the Calabrian dialect, which she took to be an indication that Barrio knew the works he censored by heart and used no edition for his assessments.[25] This may explain why some quotations are not correct and deviate from the original wording, and why some bibliographical notes are incorrect or imprecise. If Barrio quoted the works by heart, he must have been very familiar with them, perhaps even with profane vernacular poetry in general.

Why Barrio prepared the censorships has not yet been clarified. It is possible that they relate to the second edition of his volume *Pro lingua latina*, *De aeternitate Urbis* and *De laudibus Italiae* published in 1571. They date from a time when Constabile published the general prohibition of poetic genres and when the *Avertimenti* on Speroni's *Dialogo d'amore* and the *Rime* of Ariosto,

22 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XXXVI/6c, [no page], cf. Ind. II/1, 174 and Ind. Diar. II, 158v.

23 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 815 and 876.

24 Cf. Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.

25 Ibid. 183.

Sannazaro and Bembo were written. One could assume that Barrio prepared them on his own initiative, like Passarelli,[26] since none of them is entitled 'censura,' but they could also have been commissioned by the Congregation for the Index or by its prefect Sirleto. In theory, Barrio's censorship could be linked to the interrogation of Speroni led by Constabile, which also took place in the early 1570s.

During his interrogation Speroni pointed to the significance of Petrarch's poetry as a model for vernacular poets and he used it to defend his manner of writing against Constabile's criticism. It is thus feasible that this drew the attention of Constabile or the Congregation for the Index to works of Petrarch and other poets. It may be a mere coincidence, but Speroni's case was again discussed in the early 1580s. One could also verify whether there is a connection between Barrio's assessment of *Orlando furioso*, which is part of the first copy, and Gabriele Paleotti's denunciation of the same made in 1572.[27]

Because of its form, content and precision, Barrio's censorship of Petrarch can be considered a censorship ("censura"). The commentaries on Dante, Ariosto and Sannazaro are less elaborate and detailed, but their intention to judge the censored texts also qualifies them as censorships. There are no suggestions as to how the texts could be corrected; on the contrary, Barrio asks for the suppression of these and similar texts. Therefore these assessments were not prepared for an expurgation or with the intention of preserving the works, and were assembled accordingly. As the *Orlando furioso* and other epic poems were to be suppressed in 1576, Barrio's assessment may have played a role in this measure.

The analogies between his Petrarch censorship and the anonymous *Avertimento* on love poetry (1.2) could be an indication that Barrio wrote it before Constabile's May *Aviso* of 1574 prohibited poetic genres of an immoral nature. Passarelli's suggestion of placing Barrio's manuscript censorships in the early 1570s shortly after the founding of the Congregation for the Index is thus plausible.[28] The period concerned could even be restricted to the years 1572 to 1574.

Passarelli has suggested that Barrio's assessments had no consequences for the censored works because they did not lead to a prohibition explicitly expressed in the *Index*.[29] This estimation must not give the impression that

26 Ibid. 182.

27 Cf. Appendix, introduction to doc. 1.4–5.

28 See Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*', 182, see Appendix, introduction to doc. 1.3, also 1.4–5.

29 See Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.

his censorships had no consequences at all, but the consequences must be viewed in a broader context. Barrio's censorships show strong analogies to the anonymous *Avertimenti* and ask for the suppression of vernacular love poetry which was, in a sense, realized in Costabili's May *Aviso*. The censorship and prohibition of poetry of one of Petrarch's greatest imitators, Bembo, can be better understood in the light of Barrio's judgments, and they were used again ten years later when the poets were re-examined with the help of judgments on Tauler and Drusius.

Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, 142r–4v[30]

1.3a Barrio's Introduction I

Iesus

In tertio libro pro lingua latina, praeter caetera, moneo et obsecro, ut vulgares libelli tanquam lethifera animarum tabes e medio tollantur. Ponuntur hinc quarundam petrarche cantilenarum capita cum ipsarum declaratione, ut veri christi servi huiusmodi vanos auctores fugiant: et qui potestatem habent eos de caetero legi prohibeant. Idque ego dei zelo ago. Non enim inani vulgo et carnalibus hominibus obsequi, sed deo placere debemus, divi pauli memores, qui ait. Si adhuc hominibus placerem, christi servus non essem. Et prophetae, qui ait. Dissipavit Dominus ossa eorum, qui hominibus placent, confusi sunt, quoniam deus sprevit eos. Et, praeter caetera, vulgares ipsi scriptores perturbant vocabula, et sanctissimum dei nomen profanant. Nam non deu dicunt, sed dio. Et dios graecum vocabulum est genitivus casus a zeus, quem latini iovem appellant, qui fuit filius saturni: et poetae fingunt ipsum esse aetherem et aerem. Quare latinitas dicit sub dio id est sub aere. Et Graece dicitur dios dia dion idest generosus sa sum adiective quasi a iove genitus. Quia vero ignorantia est omnium malorum tum inconstantiae mater: vulgares ipsi scriptores nunc dio dicunt, nunc idio et interdum geminato d pro deu ~~dicunt~~. Et idios in latina lingua nihil significat, graece vero significat proprium et privatum, non significat deum, quem graeci theon dicunt. Non ergo profanari debet dei nomen, ut pro deu vulgare dio vel idio dicatur. Et ut idolatrae Iovi tribuamus ea, quae dei sunt. Neque est utendum prava vulgi consuetudine: nam neque prava consuetudo, qui abusus est dicendus, neque falsa opinio facit ut vitrum sit adamas, aut contra. Et cyprianus et augustinus, et caeteri sacri doctores

30 The document has already been reproduced in ibid. Cf. above n. 19.

dicunt. manifestata veritate cedat consuetudo veritati: nam christus non dixit, ego sum consuetudo, sed veritas. Neque dicendum est quod aliud est vulgare, aliud latine loqui: nam vocabula semper idem significant. Panis enim, vinum, oleum idem significant in vulgari[31] sermon, quod in latino. Et qui contemnit aut erubescit vulgare deu dicere, et dio vel idio dicit, videat quo in errore versetur. Unius enim litterae mutatio mutat vocabuli significatum, ut ficus focus fucus, nato noto nuto,[32] fractus frictus fructus, panis penis. Quinetiam accentus mutat significatum ut una et unà, palam et palàm et alia eiusmodi innumera. Nunc ad petrarcham redeamus.

1.3b Petrarch's *Canzoniere* I

Parà forsi ad alcun che laudi quella
ch'io adoro in terra . . . (247.1)
Giovene donna . . .
l'idolo mio . . . (30.1 and 27)

Profanus homo in his duabus cantilenis semet idolatram esse ostendere non erubescit. dicit enim se in terris lauram amasiam suam adorare eamque deum suum appellat.

Pasco la mente d'un sì nobil cibo
che ambrosia e nectar non invio a iove . . . (193.1)
Sì come eterna vita è veder dio . . . (191.1)

In his duabus cantilenis suam beatitudinem et felicitatem in voluptate epicureo more ponit, quam beatitudinem coelesti beatitudini comparat. dicit enim sicut aeterna felicitas est beatis dei visio, ita sibi aeterna felicitas est videre lauram.

Tacer non posso e temo non adopre . . .
io ero in terra e'l cor in paradise . . . (325.1 and 46)

In hac etiam cantilena suam beatitudinem ponit in voluptate, nam se cor in paradiso habere dicit cum lauram contemplatur.

---

31 Barrio first: *vulgare*, corrects *vulgari*, cf. Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.

32 Barrio in marg. *faveo foveo*.

Lasso quante fiate, Amore me assale . . . (109.1)
Pien di quella inestimabile [sic] dolcezza . . . (116.1)

In his duabus cantilenis dicit semper se in memoria habere lauram, ita ut nihil aliud cogitet.

O invidia nimica de virtute . . . (172.1)

Veneream in lauram concupiscentiam appellat virtutem, et se felicem amantem vocat, et suam salutem ponit in laura.

Era il giorno che al sol si scoloraro
trovommi amor del tutto disarmato . . . (3.1 and 9)

In hac cantilena fatetur se religione ac pietate nudum fuisse, quod eo die, quo christus cruci est affixus turpi in lauram amore captum fuisse dicit, et culpam in cupidinem reiicit.

Quel che infinita . . . (4.1)

Nefaria comparatio. In hac enim cantilena comparat lauram christo. dicit enim, sicut christus sol in humili loco est natus, ita laura sua alter sol in humili pago nata est, quam etiam saepe solem appellat.

Le stelle il ciel e li elementi a prova . . .
basso desir non è chi'vi si senta . . . (154.1 and 12)

Profana et haec comparatio. comparat enim in hac cantilena lauram beatae mariae. Nam dicit lauram pulcherrimam fuisse, sed nemo ad eius concupiscentiam carnalem alliciebat, id quod soli beatae mariae datum est.[33] ipse tamen illius amore captus est, et eo die, quo christus est mortuus.[34]

Così potessi io ben chiuder in versi
Lasso, non a maria, non nocque a pietro
la fede che a me sol tanto è nemica . . . (95.1 and 12–13)

33 Id.: ~~de~~; *sola*, corrected *soli*, cf. Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.
34 Cf. ibid. 196.

Profana comparatio. comparat enim suum carnalem in lauram affectum magdalenae et petri in christum amori ac fidei.

Movesi il vecchiarel canuto e bianco . . . (16.1)

Profana et haec comparatio. comparat enim suum carnalem in lauram affectum senis religiosi peregrini affectui ac religioni e longinquis partibus romam venienti, ut christi effigiem videret.

Quel vago impallidir, quel dolce riso . . . (123.1)

Pro pudor, quam profana et nefaria haec comparatio. comparat enim in hac cantilena amantium cupidineum pallorem et risum mutuo beatorum in paradiso gaudio.

Sel disse mai che venga in odio a quella . . .
per rachel ho servito e non per lia . . . (206.1 and 55)

Nefaria et haec comparatio. se enim iacob et lauram racheli comparat. Et gloriatur se fato, ut ipse putat, obstrictum fuisse, ut lauram periret, unde liberam hominis negat voluntatem priscillianorum more.

Anzi tre dì creata era alma in parte . . . (214.1)
Io vo pensando e nel pensier me assale
quel che ei fo . . .
né so che [spatio] mi si desse il ciel . . . (264.1, 91 and 109)
Ben sapev'io che natural consiglio
amor contra di te giamai non valse . . . (69.1)
Solea dalla fontana . . . (331.1)
beato in sogno . . . (212.1)
Verdi panni sanguigni . . . (29.1)
Fugendo la pregione ov'amor me hebe
multi anni a far di me quel ch'a lui piace . . . (89.1–2)
Voglia mi sprona, amor mi guida e scorge (211.1)
qual mio destin, qual forza, o qual inganno (221.1)
Io no'l posso negare, donna, e no'l nego
che la ragion . . . (240.5–6)

In his octo cantilenis liberam hominis voluntatem et providentiam negat, et se fato obstrictum fuisse dicit ut lauram adamaret, et culpam in cupidinem reiicit. dicit etiam rationem appetitui succubuisse.

Io ho pregato amor, e nel riprego . . . (240.1)

In hac cantilena non christum precatur, ut ipsum adiuvet, sed cupidinem exorat, ut ipsum apud lauram excuset, si vehementiore amore coactus rationem appetitui suppeditaverit.[35] Et falsos deos amantes commemorat.

Là ver' l'aurora che sì dolce l'aura . . .[36]
homi e dei solea vincer per forza . . . (239.1 and 19)
Amor con sue promesse lusingando . . . (76.1)
Hor vedi amor che giovenetta donna . . . (121.1)
Sì travagliato è 'l folle mio desio . . . (6.1)
Mille fiate o dolce mia guerrera . . . (21.1)
Ite caldi suspiri al fredo core . . . (153.1)
Vaghi pensier . . . (70.21)
Non ha tanti animali il mar . . . (237.1)
A qualunque animale alberga in terra . . . (22.1)

In his novem cantilenis sicut in aliis omnibus suum in lauram amorem libidinosum esse ostendit, liberam hominis negat voluntatem. lauram suo amori reluctatam fuisse dicit. et ideo de cupidine queritur. se infelicem vocat, quod suo amori reluctaretur, et illius concubitum cupit, suum desiderium vanum esse dicit, maledicit diei, quo natus est. et fato se obstrictum fuisse dicit, ut lauram adamaret. nec ab eius amore quiescere posse.

Tennemi amor anni ventuno ardendo . . . (364.1)
Amor io fallo e vedo il mio fallire . . . (236.1)
Occhi piangete e acompagnate il core . . . (84.1)
Patre del ciel dapoi i perduti giorni . . . (62.1)
Per mezo i boschi inhospiti e selvaggi . . . (176.1)
Il mal mi preme . . . (244.1)

In his sex cantilenis suum in lauram amorem libidinosum ac turpem fuisse apertissime ostendit. dicit enim se errasse visu, errorem suum cognoscere, tempus amisisse, suas in lauram cogitationes vanas esse, se tedere et poenitere quod tempus in vanitate consumpserit, insaniam esse ait lauram adamare.

Rapido fiume che d'alpestra vena . . . (208.1)
real natura angelico intellecto . . . (238.1)

35 Barrio adds: "ut Judas qui errore cognitu non ad apostolos ivit, sed ad pontifices."

36 Barrio: *haura*.

lieti fiori et felice e ben nate herbe . . . (162.1)
non al suo amante più diana piacque . . . (52.1)
nel dolce tempo de la prima etate . . . (23.1)
quando amor i belli occhi in terra inchina . . . (167.1)
S'io il dissi mai ch'io venghi in odio a quella . . . (206.1)
O bella man che mi distruge il core . . . (199.1)
Occhi mei lassi mentre ch'io ve giro . . . (14.1)
Quel iniquo mio dolce signore . . . (360.1)
Voi che ascoltate in rime . . . (1.1)

In his etiam undecim cantilenis suum in lauram amorem libidinosum fuisse apertissime ostendit. dicit enim se cupere illius concubitum, oscula commemorat, et se idem facere velle ait. manus et vultum laurae tangere cupit. nuditatem mulieris et atheonis in dianam amorem commemorat. lauram nudam se vidisse ait, et eius concubitum cupere dicit. dicit etiam, quod laura zelotipia laborabat <. . .>. Et chirotecas ei muneri dat, quas illi surripuisse ac restituere simulat. suum in illam amorem ab oculis provocatum dicit. cupidinem dominum suum appellat. Et queritur quod in hac vanitate tempus consumpserit. multa bona opera omiserit. deum non amaverit. animi dotes unius mulieris gratia inaniter consumpserit. se pudere et poenitere huiusmodi sui erroris dicit.[37] Vanitatem esse ait quod lauram adamaverit.

Amor mi manda quel dolce pensiero . . . (168.1)
Ben mi credea passar mio tempo homai . . . (207.1)

Quanquam alibi saepe dicit se sui erroris, quod lauram adamaverit, poenituisse, in his tamen duabus cantilenis se adhuc laurae concubitum sperare ait, et suum malum desiderium aetate minui non posse dicit, ut vere in eo completum sit illud solomonis. adolescens iuxta viam suam etiam cum senuerit non recedet ab ea.[38]

Più volte amor mi havea ià detto scrive . . . (93.1)

Scelestus auctor, in hac cantilena adolescentium ac mulierum pernicies. dicit cupidinem sibi iussisse, ut amantium affectus et gestus scriberet, cui libentissime paruit, qua ex re se immortalem velut alterum cupidinem esse sperat.

Non d'atra et tempestusa onda marina . . . (151.1)

37 Barrio: *pupudere*.
38 Cf. Prov. 22:6.

Et nunc et saepe amorem cupidinem intelligit, quem semper dominum suum appellat.

> De l'empia babilonia . . . (114.1)
> fiamma dal ciel . . . (136.1)
> fontana di dolore . . . (138.1)
> l'avara babilonia . . . (137.1)

Temerarius et impudentissimus homo os in coelum ponere ausus est, nam romanae ecclesiae detrahit, eam matrem, magistram, domicilium et fontem omnium malorum appellat, et haeresis templum.

1.3c Petrarch's *Trionfi* I

In lo triumpho de la divinità

> Ond'io a dito ne sarò mostrato . . . (*TE* 94)[39]
> ecco, chi pianse sempre . . . (*TE* 95)

Magna huius hominis vanitas et dementia imo impietas. dicit enim quod in coelesti gloria indice a beatis demostrabitur quod lauram adamaverit, et ipsa a beatis commendabitur, quia ob corporis pulchritudinem ab eo adamata fuerit.[40]

> Quando ciò fia, no'l so sassel propri'essa . . . (*TE* 100)[41]

Dicit lauram scire diem iudicii, cum neque angeli id sciant.

In lo triumfo de la fama

> Poi vidi'l gran platonico plotino
> che credendosi in otio viver salvo
> prevento fu dal suo fero destino
> il qual seco venia dal materno alvo
> e però providentia ivi non valse (*TF* III 46)

---

39 Cf. Petrarch, *TE* 94: *a dito*.

40 Abbreviation of *quod* not identical to the preceding one, expanded according to Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*'.

41 Cf. Petrarch, *TE* 100: "Quando ciò fia, nol so; se fu soppressa . . ."

Providentiam et liberum arbitrium esse negat, et omnia fato ac necessitate fieri dicit.

In lo triumfo de la morte

> Deh madonna diss'io per quella fede . . . (*TM* II 76)

Magna etiam hominis huius insania et impietas. Interrogat animam laurae, quam beatam in paradiso ponit, an in hac vita ipsum mutuo adamaverit, quam respondentem facit ipsum mutuo adamavisse, demum in ultimo capitulo triumphi mortis colloquitur cum anima laurae de turpi amore rebusque venereis.

> Altrui so, che ne ha più che me doglia[42]
> la cui salute dal mio viver pende . . . (*TM* I 52–53)

Salutem laurae non in christo, sed in vita sua ponit.

> Son disposto farte un tal honore[43]
> qual, altrui far non soglio, et che tu passi
> senza paura et senza alcun dolore (*TM* I 67–69)

e in un altro loco:

> Nessun degli adversarii fu sì ardito
> che apparesse giammai con vista obscura
> finché morte el suo assalto hebe finito (*TM* I 154–6)

In his duobus locis dicit lauram absque dolore et diabolicae visionis terrore ex hac vita migrasse, ac si una sanctarum mulierum fuisset.

> La notte che segui l'horribil caso
> che spense il sole, anzi'l riposse in cielo . . . (*TM* II 1–2)

lauram suam solem appellat idque saepe facit.

In lo triumfo de amore

> Cossì parlava et io com'hom che teme . . . (*TC* III 85)

---

42 Petrarch, *TM* I 52: *Altri*.

43 Ibid.: "Io son disposta a farti . . ."

Pro pudor formam et modum turpiter amandi describit.

> Et come tardi doppo 'l danno intendo . . . (*TC* III 103)

Dicit se impatientissimum fuisse amoris in lauram et zelotipia laborasse.

> Da l'altra parte s'io discerno bene
> questo signor che tutto il mondo Sforza . . . (*TC* III 124–125)

Hic etiam providentiam et liberam hominis voluntatem negat, et cupidinem vi omnibus mortalibus dominari dicit.

> Poscia che mia fortuna in forza altrui . . . (*TC* IV 1)

amandi lauram vim et necessitatem in se ponit, unde providentiam et liberum arbitrium negat, et se et alios amantes infelices vocat.

> Non potei coglier mai ramo ne foglia . . . (*TC* IV 83)

amor libidinosus. queritur quod numquam laura potiri ac frui potuerit.

> Hor dimmi se colu' in pace vi guide . . . (*TC* II 25)

cupidinem uti deum testatur, quem pacis datorem et auctorem vocat, pacem appellat turpem amantium consensum.

> Voglia dir signor mio se tu vince,
> ligami con costei . . . (*TP* 61–62)

Desiderium suum et perseverantiam turpis amoris in lauram ostendit, cupidinem dominum suum vocat eumque precatur, ut ipsum cum Lauram liget.

> Volgi in qua gli occhi al gran padre schernito . . . (*TC* III 34)
> Vedi qui ben fra quante spate et lanze . . . (*TC* III 52)

Profanus homo in his duobus locis dicit cupidinem de iacob, isaac, abraam et de iudith triumphasse.

Haec et alia eiusmodi multa hic profanus et perditus auctor, dux et magister spurcarum libidinum scribit. Quod autem ipsum ut poetam excusent. Videat qui voluerit tertium librum meum pro lingua latina. Quare o ecclesiarum praesules,

quibus ovium christi cura commissa est. Videte quaenam doctrina in hoc et aliis eiusmodi scriptoribus sit.

Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, 148r–9r (copy)

1.3d Barrio's Introduction II

~~Iesus~~

Quanquam ex duobus locis petrarchae altero in epistula latina, altero in principio suarum cantilenarum manifestum sit omnes eius vulgares cantilenas perniciosas et lethales fuisse (heu tot annis) esseque modo lectoribus: tamen ex aliis eius cantilenis id ostendere libuit. Si forte christi Vicarius, cui Deus oves suas pascendas tradidit et custodiendas, paulum apostolum, qui ephesi libros inutiles combussit, emulatus, et petrarcham ipsum vanitatis magistrum et alios omnes vulgares vanos, lascivos, ludicros, scurriles inutilesque libellos e medio tollendos decernat. Nam, ait paulus, corrumpunt bonos mores colloquia prava. Et Seneca, qui non vetat, inquit, peccare cum possit, iubet. Ait itaque petrarcha ipse in epistula ad olympium. Illa vulgaria iuvenilium laborum meorum cantica, quorum hodie me pudet et poenitet, eodem morbo affectis sunt acceptissima.[44] Quod autorem puduit ea scripsisse, quanto magis pudere debet lectores. Affectis, inquit, eodem morbo, utique mortifero, quo ego, inquit, affectus sum, sunt acceptissima. Et in cantilenas,

1.3e Petrarch's *Canzoniere* II

Voi che ascoltate in rime
cognosco ben, sicome al popul tutto
materia fui di error, unde sovente
di me medesmo meco mi vergogno[45] (1.1 and 9–11)

44 *Familiares*, viii, iii, 13, in Petrarca, *Le familiari*, ed. V. Rossi (Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 1968), ii.

45 Cf. Petrarch, *RVF* 1.9–11:
Ma ben veggio or sì come al popol tutto
favola fui gran tempo, onde sovente
di me medesmo meco mi vergogno.

His etiam verbis aperte fatetur se omnibus malorum causam fuisse. seque huiusce rei pudere. Nunc alia subiciam.

> Parà forsi ad alcun che laudi quella
> ch'io adoro in terra (247.1–2)
> Giovene donna
> l'idolo mio (30.1 and 27)

In his tribus cantilenis semet idolatram esse ostendere non erubescit, amasiam suam adorare illamque deum suum esse dicens.

> Pasco la mente d'un sì nobil cibo
> che ambrosia e nectar non invidio a Iove (193.1)
> Sicome eterna vita è veder dio (191.1)

In his cantilenis suam beatitudinem et foelicitatem in voluptate epicureo aristippeoque more point: quam beatitudinem coelesti beatitudini comparat. Dicit enim sicut aeterna foelicitas est beatis dei visio, ita sibi aeterna foelicitas est videre lauram.

> Tacer non posso, e temo non adopre
> io era in terra, el cor in paradiso (325.1 and 46)

In hac etiam cantilena beatitudinem suam in voluptate ponit, nam se cor in paradiso habere dicit cum lauram contemplatur.

> Lasso quante fiate amor me assale (109.1)
> Pien di quella inestimabile dolcezza (116.1)

In his duabus cantilenis dicit semper se in memoria habere lauram, ita ut nihil aliud cogitet.

> O invidia nimica de virtute (172.1)

Veneream in lauram concupiscentiam appellat virtutem, et se foelicem amantem vocat, ac suam salutem ponit in laura.

> Era il giorno che al sol si scoloraro
> trovommi amor del tutto disarmato (3.1 and 9)

In hac cantilena fatetur se religione omnino nudum fuisse, quia eo die, quo christus cruci est affixus, et in templo existens turpi in lauram amore se captum fuisse dicit, et culpam reiicit in cupidinem.

Quel che infinita (4.1)

Nefaria comparatio. comparat enim in hac cantilena lauram christo: dicit enim sicut christus sol in humili loco est natus, sic laura amasia sua alter sol in humili pago nata est, quam saepe solem appellat.

Le stelle, il ciel e li elementi a prova
basso desir non è chi'vi si senta (154.1 and 12)

In hac cantilena dat laurae quod beatae maria datum est, nam dicit lauram pulcherrimam fuisse, sed nemo ad eius concupiscentiam carnalem alliciebatur, et tamen ipse illius amore captus est, die parasceve et in templo.

Cossì potessi io ben chiuder in versi
lasso, non a maria, non nocque a pietro
la fede che a me sol tanto è nimica (95.1 and 12–13)

Profana et haec comparatio, comparat enim suum carnalem in lauram affectus magdalenae et petri in christum fidei.[46]

Movesi il vecchiarel canuto e bianco (16.1)

Profana et haec comparatio, comparat enim suum carnalem in lauram affectum senis peregrini affectui ac religioni christi vultum romae videre cupienti e longinquis partibus discedenti.

Quel vago impalidir, quel dolce riso (123.1)

Pro pudor quam profana et nefaria comparatio, comparat enim in hac cantilena amantium cupidineum pallorem et risum mutuo beatorum in paradiso gaudio.

Sel disse mai che venga in odio a quella
per rachel ho servito non per lia (206.1 and 55)

46 Passarelli corrects: *affectum*.

Nefaria et haec comparatio: se enim in hac cantilena iacob comparat, et lauram racheli, et gloriatur se fato, ut ipse putat, obstrictum fuisse, ut lauram amaret, unde liberam hominis negat voluntatem.

Anzi tre dì creata era alma in parte (214.1)
Io vo pensando, e nel pensier me assale
chel che e fo
Né so che [spatio] mi desse il ciel (264.1, 91 und 109)
Ben sapev'io che natural consiglio
amor contra di te giamai non valse (69.1)
Fugiendo la pregione ov'amor m'hebe
mult'anni a far di me quel che allui piace (89.1)
Solea dalla fontana (331.1)
Verdi panni sanguigni (29.1)
Voglia mi sprona, amor mi guida e scorge (211.1)
Qual mio destin, qual forza o qual inganno (221.1)
Là ver l'aurora che sì dolce haura[47]
homini e dei solea vincer per forza (239.1 and 19)

In his octo cantilenis liberam hominis voluntatem ac providentiam negat, et se fato obstrictum fuisse dicit ut lauram adamaret, ac culpam reiicit in cupidinem. Et rationem appetitui succubuisse dicit, ac falsos deos amantes commemorat.

Amor con sue promesse lusingando (76.1)
Hor vedi amor che giovenetta donna (121.1)
Sì travagliato è 'l folle mio desio (6.1)
Mille fiate o dolce mia guerrera (21.1)
Ite caldi suspiri al fredo core (253.1)
Vaghi pensier (70.21)
Non ha tanti animali il mar (237.1)
A qualunque animale alberga in terra (22.1)

In his octo cantilenis, sicut et in aliis omnibus, suum in lauram amorem libidinosum esse ostendit, et se fato obstrictum fuisse dicit illam adamaret, et nec ab illius amore quiescere posse ait.

Tennemi amor anni vintiuno ardendo (364.1)
Amor io fallo e vedo il mio fallire (236.1)
Occhi piangete e accompagnate il core (84.1)

47 Petrarch, *RVF* 239, 1: "Là ver l'aurora, che sì dolce *l'aura* . . ."

Patre del ciel da po perduti giorni (62.1)
Per mezo boschi inhospiti e selvagi (176.1)
Il mal mi preme (244.1)
Rapido fiume che d'alpestra vena (208.1)
Real natura angelico intellecto (238.1)
Lieti fiori e felice e ben nate herbe (162.1)
Non al suo amante più diana piacque (52.1)
Nel dolce tempo dela prima etate (23.1)
Quando Amor i belli occhi in terra inchina (167.1)
Si io il dissi mai che venghi in odio a quella (206.1)
O bella man che mi distruge il core (199.1)
Occhi mei lassi mentre ch'io vi giro (14.1)
Quel iniquo mio dolce empio signore (360.1)
Non de atra tempestosa onda marina (151.1)

In his XVII cantilenis, sicut et in aliis omnibus, suum in lauram amorem libidinosum fuisse apertissime ostendit. In quibus, praeter caetera, se tedere et poenitere dicit quod lauram amaverit, et tempus in vanitate consumpserit, multa bona omiserit, deum non amaverit, animi dotes unius mulieris gratiam inaniter consumpserit.

Amor mi manda quel dolce pensiero (168.1)
Ben mi credea passar mio tempo homai (207.1)

In his etiam duabus cantilenis se sui erroris, quod Lauram adamaverit, poenituisse, sed tamen suum malum desiderium aetate minui non posse dicit.

Più volte Amor mi havea già detto scrive (93.1)

In hac cantilena hic adolescentium pernicies cupidinem sibi iussisse ut amantium affectus et gestus scriberet, cui paruit, qua ex re se immortalem velut alterum cupidinem esse sperat.

1.3f Petrarch's *Trionfi* II

In triumpho divinitatis

Ond'io a dito ne sarò monstrato
Ecco, chi pianse sempre (*TE* 94–95)

Magna huius hominis vanitas et dementia, imo impietas:[48] dicit enim quod in coelesti gloria indice a beatis demonstrabitur, quod Lauram adamaverit.[49] et ipsa a beatis commendabitur quod ob corporis pulchritudinem ab eo adamata fuerit.[50]

> Quando ciò fia no'l so sassel propri'essa (*TE* 100)

Dicit Lauram scire diem iudicii.

In triumpho famae

> Poi vidi'l gran platonico plotino
> che credendosi in ozio viver salvo
> prevento fu dal suo fero destino
> il qual seco venia dal materno alvo
> e però providentia ivi non valse (*TF* III 46)

Providentiam et liberum arbitrium negat, et omnia fato ac necessitate fieri dicit.

In triumpho mortis

> Deh madonna diss'io per quella fede (*TM* II 76)

Interrogat animam laurae, quam beatam in paradiso ponit, si in hac vita ipsum adamaverit, quam respondentem facit se ipsum adamasse. Et in ultimo capitulo loquitur cum ea de turpi amore, rebusque venereis.

> La notte che sequì l'horribil caso
> che spense 'l sole, anzi 'l riposse il cielo (*TM* II 1–2)

Lauram suam solem appellat.

In triumpho amoris

> Cossì parlava, et io com'hom che teme (*TC* III 103)

---

48 Barrio: *imo*.

49 Abbrevation expanded to *quod* after Passarelli, 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor*' and the first copy, 142–144v. although Barrio uses other abbreviations here.

50 On the abbreviation see n. 39.

Formam et modum turpiter amandi describit.

> Et come tardi doppò 'l danno intendo (*TC* III 103)

Dicit se impacientissimum fuisse amoris in lauram, et zelotipia laborasse.

> Da l'altra parte s'io discerno bene
> questo signor che tutto 'l mondo sforza (*TC* 124–25)

Providentiam, et liberam hominis voluntatem negat, et cupidinem vi omnibus mortalibus dominari dicit.

> Poscia che mia fortuna in forza altrui (*TC* IV 1)

Amandi lauram vim et necessitatem in se ponit, unde providentiam et liberum arbitrium negat, et se et alios amantes infoelices vocat.

> Volgi in qua gli occhi al gran patre schernito (*TC* III 34)

Dicit cupidinem de abraam, isaac et jacob, quod suas coniuges amaverint, triumphasse.

> Vedi qui ben fra quante spate e lanze (*TC* III 52)

Dicit cupidinem de iudith vidua castissima triumphasse.

1.3g Dante's *Divina Commedia*

***Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, 144v–5r* (*copy 149v–150r*)**

Dantes etiam multa puerilia et bonis moribus ac religioni adversantia scribit. Nam in suo inferno canto III celestinum papam, quod pontificatui renunciaverit, damnans in inferis inter scelestos ponit. Canto IIII ethnicos multos et viros et mulieres nominatim ponit in Limbo, ubi patres veteris testamenti christi adventum exspectantes commorabantur, dicitque christum hos liberasse et illos ibi reliquisse. Cantus VII or puoi veder figliuol la corta buffa . . . Vostro saper non ha contrasto allei . . . Dicit damnatos fortunae fuisse subiectos, ut male in hac vita viventes damnarentur, nec ei humana ratio posse resistere. quae haeresis est Priscillianistarum. Canto XV Priscianum et in persona illius grammaticos taxat et mordet quasi masculorum concubitores. Canto XVIII damnatarum animarum multitudinem romanorum multitudini comparat, qui

Iubilei tempore ad divi petri templum vadunt, super ponte s. angeli sibi mutuo obviantes, unde aperte christianam religionem irridet. demum in suo inferno multis detrahit. In suo purgatorio, ~~canto I~~, ethnicos multos in purgatorio ponit, nam canto I ponit catonem, canto X traianum, canto XIV orestem. cantibus XXI et XXII statium et christianorum animas gentilium historias et fabulas narrantes facit. In suo paradiso canto IX animas beatas gentilium historias et fabulas facit narrantes. canto XX ripheum troianum in paradiso ponit. Canto XXXII ibi. dentro alempetia de questo reame . . . dicit omnia necessitate fieri. Rursus cantibus XVII et XVIIII Inferni Ibi nostro signor impria da sancto petro . . . et ibi. la dove christo tutto el di si merca . . . detrahit romanae ecclesiae. Canto V Ibi. non pensate che ogni acqua ve lavi . . . detrahit potestati ecclesiae. Cantibus XXI et XXIII detrahit romanae ecclesiae, et cardinales bestias appellat. Canto XXVII detrahit romanis pontificibus, et praeter caetera, damnat eos quod claves in signum ponunt. Canto XXVIII ibi de questo ingrasso el porco s. Antonio . . . irridet christianorum pietatem erga sanctos. Canto VIIII vituperat epistulas decretales pontificum et earum studium. Cantibus V et XI et XII detrahit monacis s. francisci et s. dominici, et aliis.

1.3h Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*

Vatican, BAV,* Cod. Vat. Lat. *6149, 146r–v

Ludovicus Ariostus vanissimus et spurcissmus homo petrarcam magistrum suum sectatus in suo furioso inque sua furia multa obscoena ac vana scribit, et sacris prophana miscet. Hic, praeter caetera, canto VIII sub haeremitae nomine religiosos viros ut lascivos et libidinosos taxat. Introducit enim haeremitam senem ac decrepitum magnae sanctaeque famae, ut alter hilarion aut paulus putabatur, qui nescio quo pharmaco mulieri soporem induxerit eamque denudaverit. Inde alia tam aperte obscoena ac spurca prosequitur, ut nullo pacto sine animi corruptela legi aut cogitari possint. Canto et XIIII multa adversus religiosos viros scribit. Dicit enim deum michaelem archangelum in terras misisse ut discordiam in exercitum hostium mittat, quam nullibi invenit nisi in monasteriis inter religiosos viros ac mulieres: inter quos neque pacem, neque quietem, neque pietatem, neque charitatem, neque humilitatem, neque silentium invenit, sed harum loco invenit iram, gulam, superbiam, invidiam, accidiam, et crudelitatem. monasteria novum infernum vocat, et religionum varietatem irridet. Canto XVII hominum in hac vita existentium peccata remissionis metam transigere dicit, quare dei misericordiam finitam intelligit. Canto XVIII dicit discordiam archangeli michaelis iussu ex monasteriis exisse, et suo loco reliquisse fraudem. Item superbiam cum discordia ivisse et suo

loco hipocrisim reliquisse (ut vitia omnia in monasteriis et virtutem nullam esse scribat).[51] Canto primo et multis aliis obscoena et lasciva scribit. Et canto XXXI et alibi felicitatem in venereo amore ponit. Canto XXXIIII Joannem evangelistam in paradiso terrestri cum enoc et helia esse dicit eumque Astolfo omnia paradisi loca ostendisse et declarasse nugatur. eique paradisi fructus ad edendum dedisse, qui tantae inquit suavitatis erant, ut merito primi parentes excusentur quod dei praecepto non obedierint. quasi deus iniuste eos puniret. (nesciens miser et temerarius, quod deus ibi angelum custodem misit.)[52] Ibi silvas et nymphas bellva venantes et amantium vota, suspiria et lachrimas esse nugatur. Ibi dapes deiectas in acervum esse, quas elemosinas esse mentitur, quae pro animarum salute post mortem offerentur. quare suffragia pro defunctis irridet. idque tantum apostolum dixisse nugatur. Rheginus quidam abas omnem aetatem suam in huius vani et pernitiosi auctoris naeniis interpretandis consumpsit, qui in lutheranam haeresim lapsus, ea, de qua scripsit, agitatus furia semet interemit vanitatis suae praemia recepturus. Episcopus quidam id vanum sectatus studium petrarcam est interpretatus, idque dum tridenti synodo interesset. Se musarum vulgarium vanitatum servum esse dicere non erubescit.[53] novem musas novem angelorum choros significare dicit. Optime, meo iudicio, provideretur si omnes huiusmodi vulgares libelli igni exponerentur.

1.3i Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and *De Partu Virginis*

Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, 146v

Jacobus sannazarus in suis plebeiis scriptis, ut est huiusmodi hominum generis mos, pastores inducit, qui saepe deorum pluralitatem teneant, eos precentur, summos, benignos, et potentes dicant, eis gratias agant, deas venerandas et solas appellent. Plura de priapo loquitur, et nescio quam nympham priapum amplectentem, obscoenam rem facit. Superstitiosa verba scribit. In libris de partu virginis satis inepta et indecora utitur comparatione. Nam beatam mariam, cum ab angelo salutaretur, nescio cui virgini in strophadibus insulis conchas legenti, et navem procul adventantem conspicienti et ob id paventi ac fugienti comparat: quasi beata maria cum ab angelo salutaretur, aufugerit. Atque dantem sectatus, locum, ubi veteris testamenti patres commorabantur, et inferorum locum, ubi animae perenniter cruciantur, eundem esse asserit:

51 Added by Barrio in the margin.

52 Added by Barrio in the margin.

53 Barrio adds *dicere* in the margin.

ibi enim cerberum et acherontem esse scribit. Beatam mariam, cum christum puerum perdidit, lachrymatam et ipsum iuventum amplexatam et exosculatam fuisse nugatur atque etiam iuxta crucem stantem effusam capillis, terras et sidera crudeles seseque crudelem, miseram et infelicem vocasse cunctaque luctisono ululatu replevisse blaterat. quasi beata maria una aliarum mulierum fuisset, ut insaniret, christi mortis causa esset, ut se crudelem vocitaret, quasi etiam christus syderum potestati fuisset obnoxius, ut haec eius mortis causa fuissent.

1.4–5 *Orlando Furioso, Cinque Canti* and *Stanze*

Early in 1572 Bishop Gabriele Paleotti informed the dean of the Congregation for the Index of books which books he deemed worthy of censorship and found missing in the Roman *Index*. Among these books was the *Orlando furioso*.[54] It is possible that Paleotti's report led to an assessment of the *Orlando furioso* in which Barrio was involved (see my introduction to 1.3) and from which resulted various measures to expel some of Ariosto's works from the book market, at least temporarily.[55] The files of the Congregation for the Index prove that the *Furioso* was extensively censored and discussed in this Congregation. Eventually the Congregation commissioned the Inquisition of Ferrara to expurgate the poem, so that an amended version could be printed (1.5).

In 1592 Roberto Bellarmino demanded that the *Orlando furioso* be mentioned *nominatim*, by title, in the *Index*.[56] Five years later, Tommaso Galletti denounced the *Furioso* (letter of June 1597) to the dean of the Roman Inquisition, Cardinal Antonio Santori. Galletti's letter contains only a brief comment on the *Cinque canti* and was passed on to the Congregation for the Index.[57] After his report was discussed by the Congregation on 26 July 1597, the Congregation decided to entrust someone ("alicui") with the censorship of the *Furioso*, although nothing happened for some time. This is suggested by the *Diari*.

In December 1599 the Congregation entrusted the inquisitor of Ferrara, Fra Giovanni Battista Scarella, with the expurgation of the complete works of Ariosto. On 23 January 1600 Galletti sent the first part of his censorship, written

54 Cf. Paleotti, *Libri nonnulli qui videntur indigere emendatione, nec sunt comprehensi in Indice Romano*, in Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6191, 246r–7r, 246v. See Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti* (*1522–1597*) (Rome, 1959–1967), 2 vols, 238. Cf. also above 64–5.

55 See above, xy.

56 Cf. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 156s and 272s.

57 See doc. 1.4a and for the letter see Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 158 and doc. III, 69.

in the vernacular, to the secretary of the Congregation asking him to pass it on to Cardinal Colonna.[58] The second part followed shortly afterwards. It includes a comment on Luigi Gonzaga's *Stanze in lode della sua donna*.[59] Meanwhile, in Ferrara, Scarella was having difficulties carrying out the expurgation. He explains to Valier that the competent theologians needed for this project were busy with preparations for Lent, so the correction could not be carried out immediately. Moreover, he could not get copies of Ariosto's works at Ferrara except for the *Furioso*, but he promises to continue to try:

> Quanto puoi alla censura dell'opere dell'Ariosto, io ne ho fatto parolla con Monsignor Reverendissimo Vescovo nostro, mostrandoli la lettera di Vostra Signoria Illustrissima et da canto mio non mancherò di attendervi ma, stando l'occupatione di Theologi più idonei a questo negotio per le Prediche quaresimali, non si puotrà effettuar così presto la speditione di detta censura, come anco perché sin'hora non trovo le comedie dell'Ariosto, che è una parte principale che ha bisogno di correttione, per quanto intendo, et dal Furioso in fuora non si trovano a Ferrara alle librarie altre opere dell'Ariosto et si cercano per altre vie né si mancherà di diligenza.[60]

Scarella underlines that Ariosto's comedies are in need of correction. This is noteworthy because in the files of the Congregation for the Index as well as the Roman blacklists of the time the comedies are hardly ever mentioned *nominatim*. It is probable that they were included in Constabile's general prohibition of "comedie dishoneste di nessuna sorte" expressed in the May *Aviso* of 1574.

About a month later on 26 February 1600, the Congregation again entrusted Scarella with the expurgation of the *Furioso*. The instruction was repeated on 1 March 1600.[61] The Congregation received the correction (*Correttione*) of the *Furioso* a few months later, as Scarella sent it to Valier in September 1600.[62] The Congregation reacted quickly by expressing its gratitude to Scarella and instructing him to launch the expurgation of the *Satire* and Francesco Alunno's

58 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 104v: "… et conclusum quod alicui committatur censura Orlandi, ut deinceps correctus imprimatur…" Ind. V (1582–1601), 113r, letter dated 3 December 1599 and Appendix, doc. 1.4b–c.

59 Tommaso Galletti, 'Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto/Delli errori del Furioso', in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 306–308v, id., 'Censura sopra la seconda parte', ibid., 305r–v.

60 Letter from Scarella to Valier, dated 9 February 1600, quoted after Fragnito, 'Vanissimus et spurcissimus homo', 118.

61 Cf. Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 130v, Ind. V (1582–1602), 121r.

62 Cf. Fragnito, 'Vanissimus et spurcissimus homo', 118.

Ricchezze della lingua volgare sopra il Boccaccio.[63] However, as Fragnito shows, Scarella did not carry out the correction of the *Satire* because he deemed it superfluous after the edition provided by Francesco Tosi in 1591 and Bonfadino in 1593.[64] By contrast, the *Ricchezze* was corrected according to order.

The *Correttione* prepared in Ferrara was based on an edition published in Venice in 1552 by Giolito. As this edition contains, in addition to the *Orlando furioso* and *Cinque canti*, *Stanze di m. Lodovico Ariosto nelle quali seguitando al canto trentesimosecondo la materia del Furioso, si descrive la roina di Roma et d'Italia dal tempo di Costantino per insino a la nostra età*, the correctors had included them in their assessment and therefore the document also includes instructions for their expurgation.[65]

1.4a *Cinque Canti* I

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 304v

Nelli cinque ultimi canti del Ariosto nel primo canto a stanza 91 vi si trovano l'infrascritti versi

> Altri diceano d'altra openione
> Questa è la santa nave ch'al ciel varca,
> Che Pietro tol da Roma acciò ne l'onde
> Di stupri et simonie non si profonde (*CC* 1.91.5–8)

1.4b Galletti's Letter to the Secretary

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. S, 217r–v

Molto Reverendo Padre mio Osservatissimo (= secretary of the Congregation for the Index)

Hieri fui due volte da V.P. molto Reverendissimo per trattar con essa lei d'alcune cose per darle la censura fatta sopra il Zechio, con la prima parte dell'Ariosto <. . .>

63 Cf. Vatican, ADCF, Ind. V, 132v, Ind. Diar. I, 23r (25 June 1587) and S.O., St. St. Q3-d, 112r (17 October 1578).

64 Cf. Fragnito, 'Vanissimus et spurcissimus homo', 118 at n. 43.

65 Ariosto, *Orlando furioso con i cinque canti* (Venice: Giolito, 1552), 222r–5v, contains *Stanze del signor Aluigi Gonzaga detto Rodomonte a m. Lodovico Ariosto*, 252r–v and *Stanze del medesimo in lode della sua donna*, 252v–3r.

La censura sopra la prima parte dell'Ariosto la faccia vedere all'Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Signor Cardinal Colonna splendore e ornamento rarissimo di questa Città e del Collegio. Pasco severamente, perché metto un libro all'ordine a posta, inserendovi un latino, che 9 anni sono io feci contra libros obscoenos. E hora lo traduco per utilità di tutti in lingua volgare, a fine che tutti veggono quanto io sempre sie stato difensore e accrescitore della castità, del che ne ponno far fede <. . .> in 10 anni che ho ragionato in Chiesa nostra di Napoli e Roma i Comentarii miei sopra la Cantica di Salomone visti da valenthuomini e il trattato de Perfetto Religioso.

23 di Gennaio 1600
Tommaso Galletti

1.4c *Furioso* I

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 306r–308v
Tommaso Galletti, *Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto*

Nel canto Terzo, nella seconda stanza dice il Poeta troppo licensiosamente:

> Servata, e servara, s'in me non erra
> Quel profetico lume, che mi inspiri (3.2.6–7)

Non mi par s'habbi a comportare, che un poeta Christiano scrivendo a Christiani, possa attribuire tanta forza a febo, di comunicar spirito prophetico, essendo la prophetia dono molto sovrano, che da Idio solamente deriva. Cangisi dunque il verso in questa o in altra guisa:

> Quel più secreto Lume, che mi inspiri (3.2.7)

Nella stanza decima, comincia il Poeta a favellare di Merlino molto imprudentemente, ma l'undecima stanza è intolerabile, et è questa:

> Col corpo morto il vivo spirito alberga
> sin ch'odo il suono dell'angelica tromba.
> Che dal ciel lo bandisca, o che v'el erga (= ve l'erga)
> secondo che sarà corvo o colomba (3.11.1–4)

Qual sia stato Merlino di chi si parla, non entro a discorrere più lungamente, dico si bene, un orror sì grande devessi cancellare dalle Christiane carte, è

contro la fede asserire che l'anima stia sino al ultimo giorno del giuditio senza premio e gastigo; secondo che l'opre richieggino, e già sapiamo che molti <. . .> sono censurati da Fra Sisto nel libro della sua *Biblioteca santa*, perché tennero l'anime de giusti stare in alcuni roccettadoli sino al ultimo dì.

Vedesi di più la schiochezza del Poeta in questo canto assai solenne, nella stanza x chiama Merlino Mago, Ch'edificò Merlino il savio Merlino Mago aggiugne l'inganno ch'una Donna gli ordi, Dove ingannollo la Donna del lago e nondimeno nella stanza 13 lo fa chiamar Profeta, così introduce Bradamente

> Di che merito son io
> Ch'antiveggian propheti il venir mio (3.13.7–8)

Peggio si porta nella stanza ventesima seconda, quando dice:

> in sé chiuder del gran propheta l'ossa (3.22.6)

Non bastò al Poeta contaminare i cuori con le molte sue dishoneste narrationi, che vuole oltre a i malvagi e dishonorati esempi, introdurre persone d'autorità, che biasmino le leggi contrarie alla libidine e conservatrice della pudicitia. Quindi è, che nel canto Quarto in molte stanze fa parlar Rinaldo, per altro valoroso e honorato Cavalliere, in questa guisa nella stanza 59 canta egli:

> L'aspra legge di Scotia empia et severa,
> vuol ch'ogni donna, e di ciascuna sorte (4.59.1–2)

Nella 61 (=63). Rinaldo dopo che ha ben pensato, dice così:

> Sia maladetto chi tal legge pose
> e maladetto chi la puo patire con i dua seguenti (4.63.5–6)

Nella 63 (=65) segue l'istesso:

> E dico che fu ingiusto, e che fu matto,
> chi fece prima li statuti rei,
> e come iniqui rivocar si denno,
> e nova legge far con miglior senno (4.65.5–8)

Nella seguente stanza legesi una biastema, imperoché giudicha Rinaldo esser da scioco, lo stimar grieve fallo, quando una virgine consenta a qualche men che honesto comercio

che pare
al ignorante vulgo con grave eccesso (4.66.3–4)

Se il buon poeta se fusse lagnato del acerbità della pena, forse trovato havrà chi lo scusasse, attesa che ad alcuni la pena della Morte a con simil delitto parve al quanto severa, ma lodando egli il vitio con tanta solennità, di grandissimo biasimo si rende degno.

Nel canto sesto ove si favella di Astolfo transformato in mirto, parmi di avvertire che se la metamorfosi de gentili si tolerano, non si devono sofferire quelle che fingono i Poeti Christiani, massime per non fomentare una vana opinione del vulgo, il quale tal volta ha creduto, che le streghe habbino possanza di transformar le creature ragionevoli in varie sorti d'animali.

Del canto settimo si può, anzi per dire il vero, si dee levare la ventesimanona stanza tutta intera, come dishonestà è sfacciata, quantumque con grande honore e utile della pudicitia, de due precedenti s'havriano da cancellare.

[Non così strettamente edera preme
pianta ove intorno abbarbicata s'abbia,
come si stringon li dui amanti insieme,
cogliendo de lo spirito in su le labbra
suave fior, qual non produce seme
indo o sabeo ne l'odorata sabbia.
Del gran piacer ch'avean, lor dicer tocca;
che spesso avean più d'una lingua in bocca. (7.29)][66]

Nel canto octavo due stanze cioè la 49 e la 50 sono degnissime di ferro e fuoco per la intolerabil puzza dell'oscenità.

[Egli l'abbraccia et a piacer la tocca,
et ella dorme e non può fare ischermo.
Or le bacia il petto, ora la bocca;
non è ch'il veggia in quel loco aspro et ermo.
Ma ne l'incontro il suo destrier trabocca;
ch'al disio non risponde il corpo infermo:
era mal atto, perché avea troppi anni;
e potrá peggio, quanto piú l'affanni. (8.49)]

66 Quotation taken from Ceserani and Zatti.

Nel canto nono, mi paiono degni di censura i dua [sic] primi versi della seconda stanza, ne i quali l'Ariosto si gloria di seguitare Orlando, di cui nel fine della prima stanza disse

> E di sé poco, e men cura di Dio (9.1.8)

Mostra poco giuditio e pocho [sic] senno, quando dice

> Ma l'escuso io purtroppo, e mi rallegro,
> Nel mio difetto haver compagno tale (9.2.1–2)

Nel canto Terzodecimo dalla stanza 39 levisi quel verso precipitoso e irreverente e fatto a imitatione di quelle schiochezze temerarie dell'Erasmo:

> Una altra ch'hebbe più propitii i santi (13.39.5)

Par che introduca un serpente haver havuto vita da i santi, quando scampò da un colpo mortale di un huomo.

Nel 14 canto è degno di lima e di martello il pensier temerario d'introdurre S. Michele in Dialogo con la fraude, e la discordia, ma quando paia da tolerarsi, expungantur omnino, l'ottantesima prima e l'82 stanze cotanto ingiuriose al nobilissimo stato de religiosi.

> [Né Pietà, né Quïete, né Umiltade,
> né quivi Amor, né quivi Pace mira.
> Ben vi fur già, me ne l'antiqua etade;
> che la cacciâr Gola, Avarizia et Ira,
> Superbia, Invidia, Inerzia e Crudeltade.
> Di tanta novità l'angel si ammira:
> andò guardando quella brutta schiera,
> e vide ch'anco la Discordia v'era.
>
> Quella che gli avea detto il Padre eterno,
> Dopo il Silenzio, che trovar dovesse.
> Pensato avea di far la via d'Averno,
> che si credea che tra' dannati stesse;
> e ritrovolla in questo nuovo inferno,
> (ch'il crederia?) tra santi ufficii e messe.
> Par di strano a Michel ch'ella vi sia,
> che per trovar credea di far gran via. (14.81–82)]

Il principio del canto 17 ha bisogno di destrissima interpretatione, imperoché molto favorisse (almeno in vista) l'eresia de' Novatiani, quando dice

> Il giusto Dio quando i peccati vostri
> Han di remission passato il segno (17.1.1–2)

Il quinto (=6) verso si dee cangiare in tutti i modi, et è questo

> E dà lor forza, e di mal fare ingegno (17.1.6)

Nel canto 18 verso il fine, in quella stanza che comincia, Venuto era, ove il Poeta, perché parla di un Duca e d'una Dama sua, che par non gli fusse legitima moglie; essendo amendue con un sol colpo uccisi, non l'havea da esclamare al sesto verso

> O felice morire, o dolce fato (18.179.6)

Nel istesso canto finge l'Ariosto poco più sotto, che la luna invocata da Midoro come Dea, e Dea vera corrispondesse con gli effetti alla sua falsa fede, così dice egli

> La luna a quel pregar la nube aperse,
> o fusse caso, o pur la tanta fede (18.185.1–2)

Del canto 25 si devono levar via le otto stanze empie e profane, ove s'introduce Ricciardetto, contare una metamorphose di sexo, comincisi da quella, che ha tal principio

> Et ho possanza far cose stupende (25.62.1)

Quantumque molti vulgari congionghino quella voce, di miracolo e miracoloso, a cose e attioni molto basse, parmi che non si deva usare tale epiteto Dal Poeta in materia di prove donnesche, come in quel verso

> Nei secoli avenir miracolose. parla di Bradamente stanza 2.8 (26.2.8)

Nel medesmo canto, alla stanza 30 (=32), che comincia, per tutto haver. I quatro [sic] versi ultimi giudicarei, s'havessero da tor via,

Peggio facea nella Romana corte
ch'v'havea uccisi Cardinali e Papi
Contaminato havea la bella sede
di Pietro, e messo scandali nella fede (26.32.5–8)

Nella 96 (=128) stanza che comincia, Malagigi, che sa d'ogni ecc., truovato questo verso degno d'esser tolto,

Con che fermare il sole era possente (26.128.4)

Non si dee ametter tanta possanza in un Mago, con error contrario alla divina providenza.

Tra i Christiani non s'hanno d'ammettere quelli affetti sciochi della cieca gentilità attribuiti da quella a i falsi Dei, perciò lievesi il seguente verso della stanza 35 canto 27

Nel viso s'arrossì l'angel beato (27.35.1)

Parlasi di S. Michele, come che si vergognasse d'esser poco ubbidito.

Ma chi tolerar puote la licenza inconsideratissima del seguente verso nella stanza 38 registrato?

Indi le rupe un manico di croce
Per la testa, pel dosso, e per le braccia (27.38.1–2)

Fatto indegnissimo ch's'attribuisca lo spezzare un legno di Croce tanto venerabile stendardo, a un spirito celeste, a un defensor della Chiesa.

Nel medesmo canto ventesimo settimo, l'ariosto si mostra fuor di senno, parlando della forza di Rodomonte, che si puotrà dire smisurata, ma non infinita, disse nella stanza 79

Non era la possanza e la fierezza,
di Rodomonte ancor ch'era infinita, (27.79.1–2)

Nella pazza querela di Rodomonte, si contengono molte particularità degne d'esser osservate, dicesivi con falso fine, da cui si mosse Dio a formar la Donna et di più, che la natura non può far cosa perfetta, perché è femina. io crederei, che se bene a molti paiono tolerabili queste ciancie, perché s'introduce un pagano, s'havrano nondimeno da torre via due stanze, l'una comincia, Credo che t'habbi la natura. e l'altra, Perché fatto non ha l'alma natura.

Tutto il canto 28 si potria levare, già che l'istesso Poeta, sia per altra sua consideratione, dice che la sua historia ne può star senza, e a dire il vero, che contiene novelle pestilenti e indegne d'un Christiano.

Nel canto 29 nella stanza 7 (=8) conta miracol finto sopra lo scampo dell'eremita che Rodomonte si spiciò da lato, non è da tolerar quel verso della seguente stanza

> S'hebbe da canto il garrulo eremita (29.8.2)

Scioccamente chiamando, il mantenitore della castità efficace, garrulo.

Nel medesmo canto introduce il Poeta Idio che lodi l'atto d'Isabella, già moglie di Zerbino (e non è dubbio che rubbò egli l'historia d'Eufrasia) ma in questo merita biasmo, perché introduce sua divina maestà a lodar l'atto di Lucretia,

> E disse più di quella ti commendo,
> La cui morte a Tarquinio il Regno tolse (29.28.3–4)

Quel che dice nella seguente stanza non s'ha da tolerare, perché introduce Idio prometter cose, che poi non si osservano,

> Per l'avvenir vuol, che ciascuna ch'habbia
> Il nome tuo, sia di sublime ingegno,
> E sia bella, gentil, cortese, e saggia (29.29.1–3)

Nel canto trentesimo il Poeta si porta molto irreligiosamente, nella terza stanza giura che una donna per non consentire alle sue voglie, habbi gran torto:

> Sallo Dio, s'ella ha il torto, e sà s'io l'amo (30.3.8)

Thomas Galletus Congregationis Oratorii Presbyter

1.4d *Furioso* II

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 305r[67]

Tommaso Galletti, *Censura sopra la seconda parte*

67 The section "Intorno ai Cinque canti" is reproduced in Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, III, doc. 71.

Nel Canto Trentesimo Quinto dalla Ventesima stanza in giù s'introduce parlar S. Giovanni Evangelista molto bassamente parole molto strane, devesi adunque cangiare il nome del personaggio.

Dal Canto 37. nella stanza .116. leggesi questo verso, da cancellarsi o cangiarsi.

> O's'altro giuramento vi è piu stretto (37.116.6)

Dal Canto 39. parmi che si devino lievar quelle stanze, nelle quali trattasi di finti miracoli, comincia la diceria da quei due versi della 26. Stanza.

> O stupendo miracolo, che nacque
> Di quelle frondi, come fur nell'acque (39.26.7–8) sino

a quelli altri

> Miracol fu vedere le frondi sparte (39.28.1)

Nella stanza .78. del medesmo Canto, che comincia, ma il suo fiero ecc. tolgansi quei dua verseti.

> Vuol che l'armata che naque di fronde
> Miracolosamente ne la spiaggia (39.78.3–4)

Non è d'huomo considerato, il chiamar santi gli empi, come fa l'Ariosto nella 9. stanza del .40. Canto, mentre dice.

> Dentro a Biserta i sacerdoti santi (40.13.1)

Nella stanza 102. del Quarentesimo 3. Canto. parmi che non s'habbin da tolerare quel verso,

> In altri tempi ad un sol nostro detto
> Il sol si ferma, e la sua luce ammorza. (43.102.5–6)

Piacemi che i tre luoghi del 44. Canto siano censurati.

Ponno havere qualche male intendimento quei dua versi del Quarentesimo VI. Canto nella 86. stanza, che così dicono,

> Quel Constantin, di cui doler si debbe,
> La bella Italia, sin che giri il Cielo (46.84.1–2)

1.4e *Cinque Canti* II

***Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 305r–v* (*part of 1.4d*)**

Galletti, *Intorno a i cinque canti*.

Parole assai superbe e orgogliose, parmi che sian queste del Canto secondo, nella .42. stanza, ove dice,

> Prima che mai lasciarti l'honor torre
> Dei mille vite perdere, non ch'una (*CC* 2.42.3–4)

Nel Canto Quarto alla Stanza Quarentesima parlasi delle mutationi fatte da Alcina, in questa guisa,

> Delle conversion, che questa ria
> Ha fatto in fiere, in fonti, in sassi, in piante,
> De i cavallier, di ch'ella è stata amante (*CC* 4.40.6–8)

Perciò giudico s'habbino da tuor via, sì come i dua primi della seguente stanza.

Ha bisogno di cangiarsi quella voce, gloria, in quest'altra gioia, acciò non renda il verso penultimo della 76. stanza del Canto parimente .4. più integrato e perciò m'imagino ch'in altri migliori essemplari, così dica,

> Maggior gloria e nel regno degli eletti, ciò è maggior gioia (*CC* 4.76.7)

È gran temerità dell'autore il contar tante cose sagre per uso de nigromanti, tuto che sia vero, essi abusan molte cose simiglianti, si possono adunque cancellar questi versi del canto .4. (=5) nella stanza 23.

> Dove imagini sacre, sacre carte,
> Sacri altari, pietre sacre, e sacri vasi,
> Et altre cose appartinenti all'arte (*CC* 5.23.3–5)

1.4f Luigi Gonzaga's *Stanze in Lode Della Sua Donna*

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. O, 305v

Nelle stanze del Signor Aluigi Gonzaga, parlo delle 2 in laude della Donna dell'Ariosto, ci sono questi versi da correggere.

Nella terza stanza questi dua versi non si ponno soffrire

> Chi non sa, dal ciel, e dalle stelle
> Solo dipende nostra vita, e morte? (*In lode della sua donna* 3.1–2)

Nella quarta stanza, nel verso ultimo l'hiperbole è più che poetica.

> Solo possente a rischiarar l'inferno. (*In lode della sua donna* 4.8)

Thomas Gallettus Congregationis Oratorii Presbyter

1.5a *Orlando Furioso* Expurgated I

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 314r–316v[68]

Correttione dell'Orlando Furioso di Lodovico Ariosto, fatta nell'Inquisitione di Ferrara l'Anno 1600 conforme alla stampa di Giolitti in Venetia l'Anno 1552

Canto 2.º stanza 12 si levi,
Che scontrò un eremita in una valle: sino, a, Erano nel bosco, e non stavan al rezo, (2.12.6–15.6)
20 si levi,
Fece il destrier che haveva inteletto humano: sino, a, Rinaldo il caccia d'ira, e d'amor caldo, (2.20.5–23.4)
Canto 3.º stanza 9 si levi,
Non gionta qui senza voler divino: sino, a Dovevi per insolito camino (3.9.2–5)
11 si levi,
Col corpo morto il vivo spirito alberga: sino, a, Vive la voce, e come chiara emerga (3.11.1–4)
12 si levi,
Cimiterio (3.12.1)
13 si levi,
Profeti (2.13.8)
14 si levi,
Che chiudeva di Merlin l'animo, e l'ossa (3.14.4)
21 si levi,
Chiesa (3.21.1)
22 si levi,

68 On Ariosto's case see introduction to doc. 1.4–5, also 1.7 and 1.7b.

Sacro cerchio, e gran profeta (3.22.2 and 6)
52 si levi,
Colei dall'altro che più giustamente: sino, a, E quante volte uscirà giorno e note [sic], (3.52.5–8)
Canto 4º stanza 63 si levi,
Sia maledetto chi tal legge pose: sino, a, Sia vero, o, falso che Genevra tolto (4.63.5–8)
65 si levi,
E dirò che fu ingiusto, o che fu matto: sino, a, S'un medesmo ardor, (4.65.5–8)
66 si levi,
All'ignorante vulgo un grave eccesso, (4.66.4)
67 si levi,
Che fur gl'antichi ingiusti: sino, a, Poiché la luce candida, (4.67.6–8)
Canto 6º stanza 72 si levi,
Paradiso, (6.72.8)
Canto 7º stanza 4 si levi,
Che i vescovi, e prelati usano in corte, (7.4.8)
9 si levi,
Fosse Dio sceso dal superno choro, (7.9.8)
13 si levi,
Il paradiso (7.13.8)
15 si levi,
Gl'Angelici sembianti nati in Cielo (7.15.7)
Canto 8º stanza 29 si levi
Eremita, (8.29.8)
30 si levi,
Eremita, (8.30.7)
32 si levi,
Il frate, (8.32.3)
33 si levi,
Eremita (8.33.7)
44 si levi,
Eremita (8.44.8)
45 si levi,
Eremita, et Paolo, o Ilarione (8.45.2 and 8)
47 si levi,
Eremita (8.42.1)
61 si levi,
Santo Padre (8.61.8)
64 si levi,

Il frate incantator (8.64.3)
Canto 11 stanza 67 si levi,
Stola (11.67.6)
Canto 13 stanza 39 si levi,
Santi (13.39.5)
Canto 14 stanza 79 si levi,
Vien scorrendo ove egli habiti: sino, a, La conobbe al vestir (14.79–82.8)
87 si levi,
Che pareva Gabriel che dicesse Ave (14.87.4)
88 si levi,
Con Benedetto: sino, a, Fe nelle scole, (14.88.5–6)
89 si levi,
Santi, (14.89.1)
91 si levi,
Del Monastero, (14.91.4)
Canto 15 stanza 26 si levi,
Solo un ovile sia, solo un pastore, (15.26.8)
Canto 17 stanza 1 si levi,
De remissione passato il segno, (17.1.2)
Canto 18 stanza 26 si levi,
Uscì de frati la medesima sera: sino, a, L'implacabil discordia (18.26.5–27.8)
Canto 19 stanza 33 si levi,
Si celebrò con cerimonie sante, (19.33.6)
Canto 22 stanza 32 si levi,
Beati, (22.32.8)
Canto 25 stanza 67 si levi,
Così la donna poiché vede, e, tocca: sino, a, La cosa stava tacita tra noi (25.67.1–69.8)
Canto 26 stanza 32 si levi,
Peggio faceva nella Romana corte: sino, a, Par che dinanzi (26.32.5–8)
122 si levi,
Monachetti (26.122.6)
Canto 27 stanza 37 si levi,
Al monastier: sino, a, per la testa. (27.37.1–38.1)
137 si levi,
Gian Francesco Valerio, (27.137.7)
138 si levi
Mai donne pudiche non si trovaro, o povere, o, di conto (27.138.5–6)
Canto 29, stanza 28 si levi,
Dal cielo il creator giù gl'ochi [sic] volse. (29.28.2)

30 si levi,
Dio così disse, (29.30.1)
Canto 34 si levi tutto:
Canto 35 stanza 4 si levi,
L'evangelista nulla glie ne tacque (35.4.5)
10 si levi,
Così venia l'imitator di Christo: (35.10.1)
17 si levi,
L'huomo di Dio che così gli rispose. (35.17.8)
29 si levi,
E sopra tutti gl'altri feci acquisto: sino, a, Duol mi di quei (35.29.1–4)
31 si levi,
Resti con lo scrittor dell'evangelo, (35.31.1)
Canto 37 stanza 74 si levi,
Et impetra per me dal Signor nostro gratia, che in paradiso oggi io sia teco, (37.74.1)
Canto 38 stanza 23 si levi,
sul carro d'Helia, (38.23.8)
24 si levi,
Giovanni, (38.24.6)
26 si levi,
Da s. Giovanni le contrade sante, (38.26.4)
Canto 39 stanza 19 si levi,
La gratia che li diè l'Apostol Santo, (39.19.5)
Canto 40 stanza 13 si levi,
Santi, (40.13.1)
Canto 44 stanza 2 si levi,
Re, Papi, Imperatori, (44.2.3)
24 si levi,
Li disse già l'Evangelista Santo, (44.24.8)
25 si levi,
Il Santo Evangelista. (44.25.1)
50 si levi,
Che né Papi, né Re, né Imperatori, non ne trahe scettro, mitra, né corona. (44.50.5–6)
Canto 46 stanza 14 si levi
Il divin Pietro Aretino: (46.14.4)

1.5b *Stanze* Expurgated

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 316r

Nelle stanze poste doppo il quarantesimo sesto, et ultimo canto, quali sequitano al canto trigesimo secondo,
stanza 5. si levi,
Nel tempo che a Silvestro dar voleva: sino, a Sul'asperi monti in una selva folta. (*Stanze* 5.5–7.8)
.9. si levi,
Del stolto Imperator doveva seguir, (*Stanze* 9.8)
14 si levi,
Il portator sospesi in Roma al muro di Latheran quando alla Messa uscire. (*Stanze* 14.2–3)
16 si levi,
Ma li maligni chierici che già quanto: sino, a, Volgendo l'anni poi sucesse quelle. (*Stanze* 16.3–17.8)

1.5c *Cinque canti* Expurgated

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 316v

Nelli cinque canti che seguitano la materia del Furioso,

Canto 1.º stanza 91 si levi,
Questa è la santa nave che al cielo varca: sino, a, Et l'altra cosa altri dicevano dal vero (*CC* 1.91. 6–8)
Canto 2.º stanza 110 si levi,
Di quel Paese, puoi fatta Regina: sino, a, Questa Fata del populo Boemo (*CC* 2.110.1–115.8)
Canto 3.º stanza 22 si levi,
Quella mostrò nel monte Sina Dio: sino, a, Poi la mostrò il Demonio a Macon Rio, (*CC* 3.22.1–4)
Canto 4.º stanza 51 si levi,
Chiesa. (*CC* 4.51.1)

Ego Frater Ioannis Maria de <s . . . c.º> lector, Theologus sancti Dominicj de Ferrara supradictam Correctionem approbo.
Ego Frater Baptista de Placentia lector theologus sanctae Mariae Angelorum de Ferrara, supradictam correctionem approbo.
Ego Frater Joannis Baptista Scarella [de Gaida Brixianus] Inquisitor Ferrarae approbo ut supra
Ego Frater Episcopus Ferrarae eandem purgationem approbo.

1.6 Fornari's Commentary on the *Orlando Furioso*

At Piacenza, two years after the expurgation of the *Furioso* on 1 March 1602, an episcopal congregation appointed by Bishop Claudio Rangoni began to censor and purge a commentary on Simon Fornari's *Spositione sopra l'Orlando furioso* (1549/50).[69] A copy of this censorship has been found in the Archive of the Congregation for the Index.[70] As is apparent from an entry of the Congregation's *Diari* dated 2 July 1600, the Congregation charged the bishop of Ferrara and inquisitor of Piacenza with the expurgation.[71]

The commission worked on this correction from March 1602 to April 1603. However, critics like Fragnito and Passarelli deny that this case deserves particular attention.[72] While Fragnito argues that the censorial authorities lost time with this correction as it was of no use because the text did not "circulate" and would not be printed in an expurgated version in the future, Passarelli maintains that this expurgation was a routine task. She holds that this case cannot be compared to the more famous "political" cases such as that of the *Decamerone*.[73]

One may doubt that the issue is so simple. It is particularly noteworthy that the Congregation for the Index deemed it necessary to expurgate even a commentary on a poetic work. At that time this was not a routine task. If one considers that this is a commentary on the *Furioso*, a work that should have been printed in an expurgated version two years earlier commissioned by the Congregation for the Index, things may in fact look different. If the corrected version of the *Furioso* was not printed because the censorial authorities hoped to find adequate guides for readers in the commentaries on the work so that the work could be left unscathed, then this case cannot be considered a useless undertaking.

---

69 Simon Fornari, *La Spositione di m. Simon Fórnari da Rheggio sopra l'Orlando Furioso di m. Ludovico Ariosto* (Florence: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549) contains id., *Della espositione sopra l'Orlando furioso parte seconda* (Florence: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1550).

70 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 295r–300v, cf. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 158 and M.A. Passarelli, 'Ein Beispiel für die Zensur vulgärsprachlicher Texte'. Godman and Passarelli reproduce only parts of the document.

71 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. V, 129v, cf. Ind. XI.1, 575; cf. Fragnito, 'Gli affanni della censura ecclesiastica', in *Rivista storica italiana* 114, II August (2002), 584–600, 594. On the members of this episcopal congregation see Passarelli, 'Ein Beispiel für die Zensur vulgärsprachlicher Texte', 284–5. Passarelli and Godman attribute this document to the Congregation for the Index or a commission created by the same Congregation, cf. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 158 and M.A. Passarelli, 'Ein Beispiel für die Zensur vulgärsprachlicher Texte', 283.

72 Fragnito, 'Gli affanni della censura ecclesiastica', 594.

73 Passarelli, 'Ein Beispiel für die Zensur vulgärsprachlicher Texte', 283.

Similar examples are rare. Lodovico Castelvetro's translation of Aristotle's poetics with commentary attracted the attention of the Roman censorial authorities and was discussed and assessed. This case reached a considerable dimension, but most cases did not, such as commentaries on Petrarch by Castelvetro and Marco Mantova Benavides, which were censored.

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 295r–300v

Copia correctionis libri Simonis Fornarij de Reggio super Ludovicum Ariostum 1602 Die prima Martij

Habita fuit Congregatio super correctione librorum prohibitorum iuxta Indicem de ordine S.mi D.N. Clementis Papae VIII publicatum de anno 1596, in qua interfuere infrascripti videlicet

Illustrissimus ac Reverendissimus Dominus Episcopus.

Amodo Reverendissimi Domini Frater Bonifacius Borg. Inquisitor Placentiae Theologus.

Augustinus de Clericis Archidiaconus, Iuris Utriusque Doctor.

Iacobus Lodula Canonicus, Iuris Utriusque Doctor.

Aurelius Marachius Canonicus Iuris Utriusque Doctor Illustrissimi ac Reverendissimi Domini Episcopi Auditor.

Pater Lelius Bisciola Rector Societatis Iesu Theologus.

Pater Alexander Clericus Regularis Sancti Vincentii Theologus.

Frater Ioannes Maria Scottus ordinis Praedicatorum Theologus.

Decretum fuit quod fiat Congregatio quolibet die Mercurij a prandio, et praeter supradictos in ea intervenire et debeat adm. R. Pr. Fr. Andreas de Cremona minor de observantia Theologus.

Item quod consignarentur libri de Duello corrigendi causa D.D. Octaviano a Porta Comiti Alphonso Scotto, et Lazaro Todisco Iureconsultis, qui videant, et huic Sacrae Congregationi referant, quid pro correctione illis visum fuerit.

Insuper quod videatur liber cuiusdam Simonis Fornarii super Ludovicum Ariostum, et in sequenti Congregatione unusquisque referat quid corrigendum invenerit.

Die 6 Martij

Habita fuit Congregatio ut supra, in qua interfuere qui supra, et incepta fuit Correctio supradicti libri Simonis Fornarij, pro ut in superiori Congregatione fuerat ordinatum. Circa quam correctionem decretum fuit ut infra.

Correctione della prima parte dell'espositione sopra l'Orlando Furioso composta da Simon Fornari.

(Avertendo che ci siam serviti dell'impressione di Lorenzo Torrentino dell'anno 1549 in Fiorenza)
A carte 4 linea 25 si toglia (Divin) et si ponga in suo luogo (singular governo)
A carte 8 lin. 12 si toglia (il giustissimo voler de Cieli) et si ponga in suo luogo (il giustissimo voler Divino)
A carte 9 lin. 22 si toglia (Divino) et si ponga (unico Ariosto)
A carte 10 lin. 8 si toglia (conciosia con sette linee sequenti insino a quel tempio inclusivamente) seguitando il contesto Dopo io etc.
A carte 11 lin. 7 si toglia (sacri) et si ponga (diligenti coltori)
All'istessa carta, lin. 8, si toglia (Divini) et si ponga (pretiosi libri)
A carte 12 lin. 17 si toglia (eternità) et si ponga (dismemoria eterna)
A carte 13 lin. 11 si toglia (sacro)
All'istessa carta lin. 16 si toglia (Divino) et si ponga (raro valore)
All'istessa carta lin. 22 si toglia (consacro etc.)
A carte 14 lin. 9 si aggiunga alla voce Immensa, quasi, et dicasi (quasi immensa)
A carte 18 lin. 9 si toglia (fortuna) et si ponga (Iddio)
A carte 20 lin. 15 si toglia (volea, insino ma per dir.
A carte 30 lin. 2 si toglia (fatali)

Die 13 Martij

A carte 36 lin. 11 si toglia (doveva) et si ponga (voleva)
A carte 41 lin. 26 si toglia (percioché Astolfo, con quell, che segue, sin, alla natura imposibili) inclusivamente, et si seguiti (similmente è ricevuti etc.)
A carte 49 lin. 18 togliasi (Battezzare) et pongasi (intitolare)
A carte 50 lin. 19 si toglia (Sapienza) aggiungasi (mondana)
A carte 60 lin. 6 si toglia (Figliolo d'Alessandro Sesto)
A carte 63 lin. 19 si toglia (Frate) et leggasi (da un falso sofista)
All'istessa carta lin. 15 si toglia (Christo Redentor nostro)
A carte 68 lin. 1 si toglia (Del favoleggiamento) sino a (anco d'avvertire etc.)

Die 27 Martij

A carte 126 lin. 10 Doppo (uscir di fori) aggiungasi (come favoleggiano) et si seguiti (per la forza etc.)
A carte 127 lin. 10 si pongano le parole di S. Paolo fedelmente tradotte volgari
A carte 128 lin. 2 (doppo la parola) li Astrologi aggiungasi (vanamente) che simile etc.

Die 10 Aprilis

A carte 134 lin. 5 si togliano quelle parole (huomo) sino a quelle (col favore) esclusivamente

A lin. 8 si toglia (occupò) et si ponga (ottenne)
A lin. 12 si togliano quelle parole (per troncar all'un di loro il naso, et all'altro la mano) et si ponga (ne fece per giustizia notabil risentimento)
A carte 163 lin. 20 si togliano quelle parole tutte cominciando da quelle, Per le racontate, etc. sin al fine et si seguiti (Giulio 2º disegna etc.)
A carte 167 lin. ultima si togliano quelle parole (secondo narra il Machiavello ne' suoi discorsi)

Die 17 Aprilis

A carte 213 lin. ultima togliasi (rimangono spogliate etc.) et si ponga (rimangono come spogliate d'ogni loro arbitrio et vigore) ragione)
A carte 235 lin. 10 si toglia (ressurettione) et si ponga (risentimento della carne)
A carte 247 lin. 15 si toglia (che fortuna apparecchiato gli havesse)

Die 24 Aprilis

A carte 269 lin. 23 si toglia (superbe) et anco (come altresi dice il Petrarca con li suoi versi appresso. Malvaggia etc.)
A carte 270 lin. 1 si toglia (A cui sta bene il crollarsi)
A carte 284, lin. antepenultima si toglia (benchè Alessandro) sino a (Pure in questo etc.)
A carte 285 lin. 1 si toglia (gli danno) et si ponga (si dette)
A carte 285 lin. 3 si toglia tutto il verso, et si ponga (perciocché stimava del Papa si dovette mover sempre a suo cenno.)
A carte 288 lin. 5 si toglia (Ma la nominò) sino al verso 17 exclusivamente difendi etc.
A carte 292 lin. 13 si toglia da: Piacque sino alla lin. 17 inclusivamente, et si ponga in suo luogo (Piacque al poeta di dipingere in questa stanza la malvaggia hipochresia d'alcuni, i quali altro non tengono di buono, che la scorza di fuori per poter con più facilità ingannare le persone.)
A carte 293 lin. 11 si toglia (la onde) sino a (breve tempo inclusivamente
A carte 293 lin. penultima doppo hoggidì si ponga tal hora.
A carte 294 lin. 18 si toglia (la mente) et si ponga (i sensi) la quale sta nella fronte si toglia, et si ponga in suo luogho li quali stanno nel capo.

Die 15 Maij

A carte 313 lin. 10 togliasi (profettare) et pongasi (predire)
A carte 347 lin. 5 si toglia (benché molti ancora superstitiosamente) et si dica (et perché si sogliono hoggidì etc.
A carte 359 lin. 9 togliasi (quando noi) sino a (di Trasimeno) exclusivamente

A carte 362 lin. 15 togliasi (indegno) et pongasi (l'honorato titolo) per (di Christianissimo) (seguitando) (com'ancora il Re di Spagna del titolo di Catholico, et si toglia quelle due particelle) fedel) che vi sono in mezzo.
A carte 366 lin. 4 si toglia (molti moderni scrittori) et dicasi (come voglioni i scrittori.
A carte 372 lin. 2 doppo queste parole) non si può (aggiungasi) se non difficilmente resistere
A carte 376 lin. 2 si togliano da, questa vicendevole) sino a Né più tua etc.

Die 22 Maij

A carte 390 lin. 29 togliasi (Deità) et leggasi (questo amore)
A carte 410 lin. 19 leggasi (da ciascun choro d'Angeli i quali secondo essi sono nove) una moltitudine) et togliasi da (talmente che Dio insino alla parola, di salirvi inclusivamente
A carte 424 lin. 4 togliasi (che Rodomonte, sino a 10. lin., et si seguiti in Gabrina etc.

Die 29 Maij

A carte 453 lin. 24 togliasi (Propheta) et dicasi (Merlin Mago.
A carte 461 lin. 3 si toglia (et come l'huomo etc. sino alla lin. 6 inclusivamente
A carte 466 lin. 14 si toglia (Santa)
—— lin. 20 si toglia (con simulatione) et si aggiunga (col patire anco la morte istessa)
—— lin. 26 si toglia (lodevole)
A carte 469 lin. 6 si toglia (et stare castamente congiunta, et abbarbicata col suo Zerbino
A carte 472 lin. 28 si toglia da (Si vede adunque etc.) sino a (nocente et colpevole) inclusivamente
A carte 474 lin. 19 si toglia (Fa etiandio di questo nome etc.) sino a (Canonizata) inclusivamente
A carte 497 lin. 6 si toglia (d'agguagliarsi) et dicasi (di farsi simile)

Die 12 Julij Junij[74]

A carte 506 lin. 1 si ~~aggiunga~~ toglia (per prophetia)
A carte 573 lin. 3 doppo (apogiandosi a quel detto dell'Evangelo) Aggiungasi (malamente da loro inteso.

74 Chronologically an entry of June should follow here, cf. the entry dated 29 June.

Die 29 Junij

A carte 595 (=594) lin. 11 doppo quelle parole Donde vuole Platone, si aggiunga (benché falsamente

A carte 602 lin. ultima sino alla lin. 14 delle carte 603 si toglia tutto cioè da (Non ti maravigliar) sino a (che con palido etc.

Die 3 Julij

A carte 638 lin. penultima doppo non possono, si aggiunga naturalmente ritornare

A carte 669 lin. 22 doppo (altissima) s'aggiunga, la quale s'innalzasse (sino al (Cielo) et si togliano le sequenti parole cioè da: Accioché, sino a: Ma tornando all'historia.

A carte 699 lin. 7 leggasi (et sì come di rado si trova virtuoso, che da qualche vitio non sia macchiato.

Die 17 Julij

A carte 704 lin. 8, doppo, ogni donna, aggiungasi, se non sta avvertita, per pudica etc.

A carte 706 lin. 21 doppo, che non gli apparteneva sapere, aggiungasi In compiacenza della moglie gustandone, etc.

A carte 711 lin. 19 togliasi Come niuno è sì felice, che dalla moglie non sia tradito) et leggasi (Come pochi sono sì felice, che dalle moglie non siano traditi)

A carte 772 lin. ultima si toglia Divinissimo.

A carte 785, togliasi la caggione perché l'Italia, sino a (Potrebbono) et si dica (possono questi duoi ricevere questa ispositione

All'istessa carta, lin. ultima si toglia dal (Benché altrimenti sino a) qui le gratie etc.

Die 11 Decembris

A carte 8 lin. 15 della 2ª parte di detto libro di Simon Fornari sopra al *Furioso* dell'Ariosto si toglia (la fortuna, et il voler de Cieli (et si legga) il Cielo.

A carte 11 lin. 4 leggasi et della fine dell'una delle dette due vie non mica risponde al principio.

All'istessa carta lin. 8 [-9] togliasi (a suo dispetto) et pongasi (facilmente)

Alla linea 11 togliasi (per forza contra sua voglia (et pongasi) di leggeri.

A carte 30 lin. 11, doppo quelle parole (che possa) aggiungasi (così bene per mancamento di esperienza raffrenare.

Die 8 Januarij 1603

A carte 45 lin. 21 si toglia (spento et sepolto) et pongavisi indebolito, et come sepolto.

Alla lin. seguente, leggasi (quasi nol vi trova.

A carte 46 lin. 4 togliasi (rimasto spento il libero arbitrio) et leggasi (rimasto indebolito il libero arbitrio. et dalla lin. 5 cioè la quale è questa etc.) togliasi sino alla lin. antepenultima esclusivamente; et si legga et di quel di tutto etc.

Alla lin. [=A carte] 47 [lin. 1] doppo quelle parole (che poscia volendo) aggiungasi da se non se ne può liberare

A carte 48 togliasi lin. 2.ª cioè (puossi etiamdio) sino alla 3.ª linea delle carte 49. cioè, nella prima giornata, inclusivamente et dove si dice poi (Ma ritornando alla prima intelligenza) si toglia (et secondo questa intelligenza si legga.

A carte 56 lin. 21 togliansi quelle parole (secondo che la mutabil fortuna vuole

Die 15 Januarij

A carte 60 [=59] lin. 22 [=23] si toglia Attiva, et si legga (voluttuosa)

Alla lin. 23 [=24] togliasi Contemplativa, et pongasi (virtuosa)

A carte 61 [60] lin. 16 si toglia Naturale.

Alla lin. 22 doppo quella parola (Combattuto) si aggiunga (et bene spesso vinto.

A carte 65 lin. 17 doppo (può esser in) aggiungasi (questa parte)

Alla lin. 18 si toglia (senza aiuto et Compagnia) et si legga (qual solo senza dependenza governa, etc.

A carte 66 lin. 11 si toglia (Attiva) et pongasi (voluttuosa) et dove si legge (contemplativa) leggasi (virtuosa)

A carte 67 lin. 1 si toglia (contemplativa) et pongasi virtuosa.

A carte 71 lin. 13 si toglia da quella parola (conciosiacosaché sino alla lin. 20, dal lor fattore, inclusivamente

Die 22 Januarij

A carte 100 lin. 15 [=16] togliasi, da quelle parole (dove in medesmo tratto, sino, et haveva nello scudo inclusivamente

A carte 117 lin. 20 [=13] si toglia da quelle parole: Ma quella Maga, sino a quelle) et quel odor che sol riman di noi, esclusivamente a carte 119 lin. 2.

A carte 121 lin. 21 si toglia Poeta Hebreo, et si legga Propheta Hebreo.

A carte 122 lin. antepenultima togliasi (Per la gratia preveniente mandata dal Divino amore.

Die 29 Januarij

A carte 141 lin. 4 doppo (che sia la sede togliasi (et della ragione) non pur) et alla lin. 5 si toglia (ma della mente et della ragione) et leggasi così (che sia la sede del vigor naturale.

A carte 144 lin. 12 doppo (il conoscimento et si aggiunga, l'uso della) et leggasi (il conoscimento et l'uso della ragione) et doppo, la quale usando, si aggiunga (con l'aiuto Divino) et leggasi (la quale usando con l'aiuto divino non potrà essere etc.

Die 19 Februarij

A carte 178 lin. 13 dove ~~si~~ si legge (che per le false dottrine) togliasi quella particella, per, et leggasi, che dalle false dottrine.

Die 26 Februarij

A carte 201 lin. 14 dove si legge il discorso della raggione, leggasi, il retto discorso della raggione.

A carte 202 lin. 24 togliasi (doppo la perduta ragione) et leggasi (doppo il perduto uso diritto della ragione.)

A carte 211 lin. 1 togliasi da quelle parole: Doppo che il Sophista, etc. sino a: Giace tra l'altro fiume, esclusivamente

A carte 212 lin. 16 togliasi: stassi Caligorante, etc. sino a quelle parole, Ver la palude, etc. esclusivamente

A carte 220 lin. 4 togliasi (anzi impossibil.

A carte 249 lin. 20 [=22] togliasi, Di tal sapor, etc. sino a: lasciando già, etc. esclusivamente

Die 5 (?) Martij

A carte 264. lin. ultima doppo quelle parole (paggi tenuti da) aggiungasi (alcuni et si legga così; paggi tenuti da alcuni signori.

A carte 265 lin. 2 doppo quelle parole (i quali impetrano) aggiungasi (tal hor) et si toglia (hoggidì) et si legga così. I quali impetrano tal hor tutti i favori etc.

A carte 265 lin. antepenultima doppo quelle parole (ma li usurai) togliasi (per aventura i Frati hodierni, o) et leggasi così ma li usurai, et cotali huomini etc.

A carte 267 lin. 4 Di versate minestre etc. tutto si toglia sino alla lin. 16 delle carte 268 et si seguiti (vide gran copia di pania con vischio

A carte 285 lin. 11 doppo quelle parole, Il che significherà che nelle corti non vi è) levisi (mai) et pongasi (per lo più) et leggasi così. Non vi è per lo più suono di verità.

Die 12 Martij
A carte 293 lin. 9 togliasi (Prophetie) et pongasi (predittioni)
A carte 293 lin. 14 togliasi (et come etc. sino a future inclusivamente
A carte 296 lin. 17 togliasi da quel verso Peggio facea, etc. sino a quelle (et dal abisso, inclusivamente
A carte 336 lin. 12 togliasi (alla fortuna) et leggasi (alli strani accidenti la colpa attribuire, le quali non pur me stesso a me tolsero.
A carte 337 lin. 14 togliasi (battezato) et leggasi intitolato.

Joannes Andreas Dionus Secretarius

1.7 From Satire to Letter Theory

The fascicle from the Inquisition of Perugia is a collection of censorships of vernacular and Latin literary and philosophical texts. It concerns, among other texts, satires by Francesco Sansovino, Ercole Bentivoglio and Ludovico Paterno as well as Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, Antonfrancesco Doni's *Zucca* (*Cicalamenti*, *Baie* and *Chiacchiere*) and *Filosofia morale*, an edition of *Lettere volgari di diversi autori et nobilissimi huomini*, the *Annotationi brevissime sopra le rime del Petrarca* by Marco Mantova Benavides, Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare* and Teofilo Folengo's *Opus macaronicum*.

Ariosto's *Satire* and the collection *Sette libri di satire* containing satires by Ariosto, Bentivoglio, Luigi Alamanni, Pietro Nelli, Antonino Vinciguerra, Sansovino, Ludovico Dolce, Girolamo de' Domini and Gerolamo Fenaruolo and published by Sansovino himself were included in the *Index* of Giovanni Di Dio in the section *Libri volgari sospetti* in 1576.[75] Sansovino's collection figured in the *Nota de libri prohibiti, et di alcuni sospesi* of the Roman Inquisition (c. 1580 according to *ILI*, ix).[76] This *Nota* does not specify whether the satire collection was prohibited absolutely or temporarily, and I have found no further information on this case in the files of the Congregation. The *Index* of 1593 lists Ariosto's *Satire* with the remark that they were prohibited until corrected and they were mentioned a second time along with the *Satire* by Luigi Alamanni and *Sette libri di Satire*, apparently still waiting for correction.[77] The files of the

75 Vatican, ACDF, Ind., XIV, see the entry under *S*, section *Libri volgari sospetti*. The *Sette libri di satire* were, however, not listed in the second class like the *Satire* by Ariosto and Alamanno, but in the third class of texts by anonymous authors.

76 For the *Nota* and its dating see *ILI*, ix, 748–9 and 9.

77 See *ILI*, ix, 909–10.

Roman Inquisition reveal that Ariosto's *Satire* had been extensively examined and that on 7 October 1578 the Inquisition sent a letter to the inquisitor of Bergamo informing him that Ariosto's *Satire* were prohibited until amended. According to the *Diari* of the Congregation for the Index, on 25 June 1587 a group of *consultores* was charged to expurgate them.[78] In 1599 Agostino Valier entrusted the inquisitor of Ferrara with the expurgation of the complete works by Ariosto and asked him for a copy of the correction.[79] Having completed the correction of the *Orlando furioso*,[80] Scarella was again asked to correct the *Satire* in October 1600. This time, however, he was explicitly instructed by Valier to preserve the *Satire* as much as possible:

> La Censura dell'Ariosto è stata grata a questi miei Illustrissimi Signori et simile potrà fare delle Satire e del resto che patisce difficoltà come anco del Alunno, se bene haverà consideratione nel censurare, che si levi meno che si può, per non interrompere il senso, variando alle volte le parole, con far che siano proportionate e ragionevoli, con che fine alle sue orationi. Mi raccomando. Di Roma li 10 d'ottobre 1600.[81]

Doni's *Lettere* were included in the *Indexes* of 1559 and 1564,[82] and two years later Giovanni added Doni's complete works ("Doni opera") to the second class of his *Index* (under the letter "D," section *Auctores suspecti*). Di Dio's annotation reveals that Doni dealt with geomancy, chiromancy and several other prohibited subjects on various occasions ("quod multis locis referta sunt Geomantiae, chiromantiae et aliarum rerum prohibitarum institutis.").[83] Doni's complete works appear on Constabile's *Lista de libri proibiti mandata da Roma 15 Augusti 1577*, with the same annotation ("quod multis locis referta sint Geomantia, Chiromantiam et [aliarum rerum proibitarum, institutis"], and a very similar entry can be found in Parma's *Index* of 1580: "Doni opera, eo quod multis locis referta sint Geomantiae, Chiromantiae, et aliarum rerum

78 Vatican, ACDF, St. St. Q3-d, 112r, Ind. Diar. I, 23r, Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, 351–5.

79 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. V (1582–1601), 113r, letter dated 3 December 1599.

80 Cf. the above introduction to the documents on the *Orlando furioso*, Appendix, doc. 1.4–5; Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 130v, Ind. V (1582–1601), 121r.

81 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. V (1582–1602), 132v, letter from Cardinal Valier dated 10 October 1600.

82 Cf. *ILI*, viii, 755 and 824.

83 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XIV. For prohibitions of Doni's works Elena Pierazzo has referred to the *Index* of Parma of 1580 that didn't appear until four years later, see ead., 'Nel laboratoio del censore: Girolamo Giovannini da Capugnano, editore della Zucca del Doni', in *Storia della lingua e filologia* (Tavarnuzze, Florence: SISMEL, 2004), 291–311, 291.

prohibitarum" and in another file of the Congregation for the Index ("6 Opera Doni multis locis referta Geomantiae, Chiromantiae, et aliarum rerum prohibitarum institutis").[84] It is noteworthy that one remark and judgment reappears in different documents, which suggests that it was transmitted through the years. Doni's complete works figure in the *Indexes* of 1590 and 1593, also chosen for correction. Yet, in 1596 the *Index* only has an entry for his *Lettere*, which were to be corrected.[85]

Doni's *Zucca* was expurgated by Fra Girolamo Giovannini da Capugnana and the revised edition was published in 1589. His *Mondi celesti, terrestri e infernali* were expurgated and appeared in a corrected version in 1597 (Vicenza: Heredi di Perin Libraro) which may explain why in 1596 the Roman *Index* mentions only Doni's letters. The Perugian document contains a judgment on *Zucca, I mondi* and *Moral filosofia* (for the dating see below) but, as explained earlier, it does not seem to connect to Giovannini's revision. Inventories and notes from local Inquisitions dating from the close of the century show which of Doni's works were confiscated and still prohibited in the periphery. The Inquisition of Ancona lists Doni's *Zucca* among the archived prohibited books.[86] The local Inquisition of Verona reports that they hold Doni's *Lettere*, *Mondi* and *Marmi*.[87] The *Zucca, Mondi* and *Marmi* are among books prohibited by the inquisitor of Genoa[88] and his letters were on a blacklist of the inquisitor of Siena.[89] Strangely enough, *La Moral filosofia*, censored at Perugia, does not appear on these lists.

The expurgated *Opus macaronicum* by Teofilo Folengo is included in the *Index* of Di Dio and *Nota de libri prohibiti, et alcuni sospesi* and *Annotatio librorum prohibitorum, et eorum qui suspensi fuerunt*: "Merlini Cocai Macharonicum opus expurg[atus]," and it seems that the documents refer to an expurgated

84 For Giovanni Di Dio, see Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XIV, section *Auctores suspecti* under letter *D, Lista de libri proibiti mandata da Roma 15 Augusti 1577*, in *ILI*, ix, 754, *Index* of Parma 1580, ibid. 752 and for the file of the Congregation for the Index see Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. A, 146r.

85 See *ILI*, ix, 802, 907, 933.

86 Cf. *Nota de libri prohibiti, et sospesi che si trovano nell'Inquisizione d'Ancona*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XXXVI 6c, 48r.

87 *Libri prohibiti, et suspensi qui habentur in Sancto Officio Veronae*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVIII, 61r–4v.

88 *Nota de libri pernitiosi del Inquisitore di Genova ricevuta 13 di settembre* [1599], in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVIII, 75r–6v.

89 *Nota librorum Inquisitoris senensis*, received 12 August 1599, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVIII, 80r–3r.

edition.[90] The Roman *Index* mentions the volume from 1590 to 1596 indicating the possibility of an expurgation (1590: "Nisi ex ratione superiorum regularum repurgatum fuerit.", 1593 and 1596: "nisi repurgatum fuerit").[91]

Editions of the *Opus Macharonicorum* published in Venice in 1564 by Bevilacqua and 1585 by Domenico Imberti contain *Zanitonella, quae de amore Tonelli erga Zaninam tractat, quae constat ex tredecim sonolegis, septem eclogis et una strambottolegia, Phantasiae Macaronicon, divisum in vigintiquinque Macaronicis, tractans de gestis magnanimi et prudentissimi Baldi, Moschaeae facetus liber in tribus partibus et tractans de cruento certamine muscarum et formicarum* and *Libellus Epistolarum et epigrammatum ad varias personas directarum*. As the prohibition refers to the "Macharonicum Opus," the entire volume is included in the list, not only the *Phantasiae Macaronicon*. The pagination of both editions mentioned above is identical with that of the censorship from Perugia. Either of them could have been used.

It is worthy of notice that a certain Germano, a monk from Santa Giustina di Padova, probably from the Benedictine monastery, reported and denounced some of Teofilo Folengo's works to Scipione Cardinal Rebiba, a member of the Roman Inquisition, on 4 December 1573. The letter is archived in the files of the Congregation for the Index, which means Cardinal Rebiba must have passed it on.[92] The letter is filed under "Informatione del libro Orlandino" because Germano dealt primarily with *Orlandino*, from which he quoted a good number of passages by heart because he had no access to an edition. At the end of the letter he approached other works: *Humanità di Christo*, described as written in *ottava rima* and which he had never seen a copy of, and "Triperuno o Chaos," that is, *Caos del Triperuno*. He specifies the language in which the latter is written as "volgare, latino, maccaronesco," its form as "verso, prosa" and its subject as "materie di teologia," but admits that it has been twenty-four years since he had read it and that he did not remember anything.[93] Folengo's *Orlandino* had already been discussed by the Roman Inquisition in the late 1550s when the *Decamerone* was examined, and was included in the *Nota de libri prohibiti, et di alcuni sospesi* (c. 1580, "Il libro dimandato Orlandino").[94]

On Baldassare Castiglione's *Cortegiano* see also 1.9.

On *Lettere volgari* see also 1.11.

90 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 749–50.

91 Ibid. 833, 893 and 963.

92 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 358r–9r.

93 Ibid.

94 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 748.

On Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare* see also 1.13.
On Ariosto's *Satire* see also the introduction to 1.4–5.

Except for the indication that this censorship was sent from the Inquisition of Perugia, this document contains no reference to its author or date of origin, and the *Diari* take us no further. As it comprises a collection of censorships, it is probable that an entire commission was set up. The document may date to the years between 1587 to 1589 because it includes a judgment on Doni's *Zucca*. As Elena Pierazzo explains, a printing privilege for an expurgated *Zucca* was granted in Venice in 1589.[95] It is possible that the author of the censorship was not aware of the expurgated *Zucca*.

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. O, 638r–82v
Censurae ex Inquisitionis Perusinae (excerpts)

1.7a Folengo's *Opus Macaronicorum*

Censurae in L. Macharonicorum Merlini[96]

In secunda epistula deleantur illa verba, Nec in caelo gratia, nec in inferno paena datur Bufonibus. Car. xi.
Macharonea 6 deleatur: Unde miser sic Christus dicere posset, Divisere sibi vestimenta mea latrones. 159.
Macharonea 7. Est locus usque Girovagi, qui initiat a pagina 173.
Emendentur illa: Illos qui renegant [176], usque ad 177. et totum alphabetum, Pr Jacobini cum sua missa, a pagina 178. usque ad illud, de Clerichettis.
In eadem Macharonea deleantur illa carmina Sordida. 181 usque ad illud carmen: Ebrietasque sedent, et (proh scelus) atra libido.
In 8. Macharonea pagina 190. deleantur illa verba, Vix in principio, Vangelia sancta Joannis, Dixerat et verbum erro factum, piva sub ulmo . . .
In 15. Macharonea pagina 312. Deleantur illa verba Scripturae incipientia, Si tamen es [Cingar sanctus,] dignusque usque ad, Divide ver a bo poteris conoscere sensum.
In 17. Macharonea pag. 342. Deleantur illa duo carmina, Ac veluti quondam [. . .] funem taccavit anello, Suscipiensque feci flammam quo cernere posset.

95 Pierazzo, 'Nel laboratoio del censore', 291.
96 Cf. Teofilo Folengo, *Opus Merlini Cocaii Poetae Mantuani Macaronicorum, Zanitonella, Phantasiae Macaronicon, Moscheae, Libellus epistolarum et elegiarum* (Venice: Domenico Imbertis, 1585 or Venice: Apud Bevilacquam, 1564).

In 21. Macharonea deleantur verba illa, Non in solo pane vivat homo, pagina 415.
In eadem Macharonea pagina 426 [=425], illa verba de Paradiso incipientia, Ingannatur homo usque ad, Ladrazzus rapuit?
In 25. Macharonea pagina 484. Deleantur illa duo carmina quibus dicitur Scotum decipere Deum. Squarnazam Scotti Fracassus repperit illic, Quam vestit, gababatque Deum, pugnatque Thomistas.

1.7b Ariosto's Satires

Censura delle Satire dell'Ariosto.

Nella Satira a monsignor Pietro Bembo, terzetto 20, l'ultimo verso:
Christiano d'acqua et non d'altro ti fenno, et 40, 41, 42.
A m. Annibale Malaguzo, il terzetto 5, 6 et 7, 8 et 66:
Tema Dio, ma ch'udir più d'una messa
Voglia il dì, non mi piace, et vò che basti
s'una o due volta [sic] l'anno si confessa.

1.7c Sansovino's Satires

Nel Sansovino.

Satira prima terzetto 9 et nella seconda satira terzetto 30.
L'ultima è tutta lasciva, contra bonos mores.

1.7d Bentivoglio's Satires

Nel Bentivoglio Hercole.

Satira prima terzetto 32 et 33 et terzetto 12 et 13.
Satira seconda terzetto 21 et 36 et 37.
A m. Antonio Musatto terzetto 7 et 8.[97]

97 *Antonio Musa* after F. Sansovino, *Sette libri di satire* (Venice: Giacomo Vidali, 1573).

1.7e Paterno's Satires

Nel Paterno.

Satira prima terzetto 17.

1.7f Sansovino's *Il Secretario*

Censure del Formolario delle lettere Missive di m. Francesco Sansovino:

Amor lascivo carta 33 usque lamentar diremo.
Lettera amatoria lasciva, a Madonna Livia Orzi.
Non senza cagione o bellissima giovane, carta 90, dele usque lamentare.
A carta 48 Nella lettera amatoria honesta scritta all'amico nostro et la seconda amorosa, usque lamento.
Carta 76 nella lettera amorosa, perché la honestà si divide usque lamentono

1.7g Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*

Censura nel *Cortigiano*.

Libro 2 in sestodecimo di stampa di Venetia appresso Girolamo Cavalcanti carta 144, in altri 77 vel 166. Nil Papa valet. et a carta 208 Pascua quotque haedos tot habet tua Roma cinedos. Item a car. 83. dove cita l'evangelio Domine quinque talenta. a car. 211 de Cardinalibus. Oremus pro haereticis, et schismaticis. a car. 210. Pr Sancto, Lascerò due officii, del tempo, et della Madonna a car. 216. Rare volte si trova Theologo, che sia buon Christiano. a car. 222. È tanto scelerato, costui, che stando in Roma potria esser cardinale.
A carta 84, vel 110. buon' usanza fare alla lotta con le donne.
A carta 283 Se io ho fatto amazzare il prete, perché non mi volete dare il benefitio.
A carta 240 Usque 244 Ubi agit de voto ridiculoso, et della burla del frate preso in groppa.

Nel libro 3 a carta 273 Appresso a gli antichi le donne lottavano.
Carta 288 et seguente, dove dice mal de frati.
Carta 333 Fino a 336. dove insegna ottener l'amor delle donne.
Carta 339 dove abutitur canticis Salomonis.

Carta 366 usque 369. dove tassa le donne in molte cose.
Nel libro 4.
Carta 393 dove de incontinentibus, nessun pecca sapendo di peccare.

Appresso Gabriel Giolito 1556: 166, 179, 181, 186, 192, 201, 210, 211, 237, 251, 252 fin'alli 287, 297, 301 usque 316, 343.
In Lione appresso Guglielmo Rovillio in sestodecimo 1550.
A carta 183, 199, 200, 201, 207, 212, 223, 232, 233, 234, 264, 319, 330, 335, 345, 346 usque 354, 357 usque ad 380.

1.7h Doni's *Zucca*

Censure sopra la Zucca del Doni

Cicalamento secondo: Si scancelli quel detto: Io amo il prossimo come me medesimo, et il consiglio dato al Gobbo.
Cicalamento 18: Nota quelle parole: fa dare al diavolo il più goffo, scancellale.
Cicalamento 22: Si cassi la interpretatione, che si dà a quel proverbio, che quando iddio vuol gastigare uno, prima gli toglie il cervello.
Cicalamento 26: Si cassi tutto per la sua dishonestà, così tutto l'ultimo Cicalamento.

1.7i Doni's *Baie*

Nelle baie del Doni.

Nella lettera, che scrive a m. Christoforo Muelichi. Cassa quelle parole: i veleni con mirabil arte gl' havevo accomodati, fino a: per non dire alla bestiale.
Baia vigesima, si scancelli tutta.
Tutta la lettera, che scrive al Cornieri [Baia ultima] si levi.

1.7k Doni's *Le Chiacchiere*

Nell'ultima chiacchiera si cassi tutta la lode della ignoranza, che scrive al signor Gregorio.

1.7l Vernacular Letter Collections

Censura sopra le Lettere volgari di diversi autori, et nobilissimi huomini.

Si levino le lettere amorose di Annibale Caro, et altri.
Tutte le Pistole di Pietro Aretino.
Tutte quelle del Boccaccio alla Fiammetta.

1.7m Benavides on Petrarch[98]

Nelle Annotationi brevissime sopra le rime del Petrarca.

A carta 81 domandò il Diavolo a san Bernardo.
A carta . . . Nel verò più peccò Giuda.

1.7n Doni's *La Filosofia morale*[99]

Nella Filosofia del Doni.

Togli via la novella ultima del secondo libro dello spetiale che comincia: Una bella donna era, perché è contra bonos mores 78.
Et a carta 88, libro terzo: Quella del Dottore, che comincia: Già fu nella Terra di Catalogna un maestro d'Intaglio.
[Trattati di diversi dei sapienti antichi tradotti nella lingua toscana]
Nel trattato secondo de sapienti antichi, dello secolare di Pavia, che comincia: A Binasco, disse M. Dino ragionando col Duca, a carta 128.

98 The edition used for this censorship is not indicated in the document, but the page numbering conforms to: [Marco Mantova Benavides,] *Annotationi brevissime, sovra le rime di M. F. P* (Padua: Appresso Lorenzo Pasquale, 1566).

99 Cf. Doni, *La Filosofia morale tratta da molti degni scrittori antichi prudenti* (Venice: Appresso li heredi di Marchio Sessa, 1567).

1.70 Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare*[100]

Censura nelle ricchezze della lingua volgare

Carta 1 a tergo, nella parola *Abbate*, si cassa: un'abbate, il quale in ogni cosa era santissimo, sino a femina.
Abbadessa: era quella notte l'Abadessa accompagnata da un Prete.
Carta 2 a fronte *Abbandono*, si cassa: frate Cipolla.
Ab[*b*]*assare*: la coda ritta.
Abeterno: quella unica sposa [dello spirito santo, per non venire ad habitare nel porcile delle femine moderne Abeterno se la preparò, sì come degna camera a tanto, et cotale Re. LA.], sin'al fine.
Carta 3 a fronte, *Accordare*: frati crudeli [Alla qual cosa il priore et gli frati crudeli s'accordarono.
Accostare: dove la giovane l'aspettava.
Carta 4[r], *Adosso*: l'abbate posto l'ochio [Addosso i.] sopra di lei.
Adorare: te adorando come mio Dio.
A tergo *Affettuosamente*: Ne quai primi congiungimenti [affettuosissimamente dal conte cercati come fu piacere d'Iddio; la donna ingravidò di due figliuoli maschi. 850 (=3.)] sino: Iddio.
Agevole: a piaceri dell'abbate.
Agio: et ella con lui sin'a: diletto. Et ella di lui con più Agio prese piacere, et diletto 1661.
Folio 5[r], *Agnol*: una delle penne dell'Agnol Gabriello, sino al fine. [1443 Questo Agnol Gabriello mi disse; che io vi dicessi, etc. 954. A pieno popolo raccontò la revelatione fattagli per la bocca dell'Agnolo Gabriello. 826. Et gli rispose; che era l'Agnolo Gabriello. 952.955. Angeli vedi al suo luogo.
Ahi: che cosa fosse il mettere in anima con gli scolari.
Ai: che cosa fosse, et
Aiato: Il prete tutto il dì, et sino a: vedere.
A tergo, *Al* corpo d'Iddio, ch'io dico da dovero.
Albergo deleatur: San Giuliano.
Folio 6 [r], *Allo* adverbium: Ruzandosi lo Monaco, et sino a: senza freno.
A tergo *allegrare*: Io giuro a Dio.
Folio 7[r], *Altopascio*: E però dice il Boccaccio usque in fine.
Folio 8[r], colonna 1 in principio [amazzata]: di farsi con una certa bacchetta, et sino: rizzare amazzata, et paulo infra: fare alzar la testa a Priapo . . .

100 Cf. Francesco Alunno, *Le Ricchezze della lingua volgare sopra il Boccaccio* (Venice: Appresso Giovan Maria Bonelli, 1555). See also Appendix, doc. 1.13.

Folio 9 [v], colonna 1. *Ampolla*: una ampolla del sudor di San Michele.
Et poco di sotto alla parola *Anche*: il Prete giocare.
Folio 10 [r], colonna 1 post medium [*andare*]: giuro a Dio, et paulo infra: Se tu andrai alle femine d'attorno li frati etc., et paulo infra: se n'andrà con l'acqua benedetta.
Folio 10 [r], colonna 2. in principio [*andare*]: se'l tuo san Giuliano.
Folio 11[v], colonna 1. *Apparare*: E perciò voi giovani donne apparate di mettere 'l diavolo in Inferno.
Folio 12[r], colonna 1. *Appartenenti*: et le divine cose etc., o a benefici appartenenti a danari vendevano, infra: che *Appetito*, che erano cadute le sue monache.
Folio 12[r], colonna 2 in principio: frate Rinaldo.

1.8 Folengo's *Orlandino*

A letter from Germano of Padua to Scipione Rebiba, Cardinal of Pisa and prefect of the Roman Inquisition on Folengo's *Orlandino* (cf. 1.7a).

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 358r–359r

All'Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo mio Signore Il Cardinal di Pisa Signor mio osservatissimo
(Informatione del libro Orlandino[101])

Veduto ch'io esser'state grate al Santissimo Offitio le Censure del D.D. Eutizio nel Folengo, ho pensato esser bene avisare il V.S. Illustrissima ch'el fratello del detto per nome Theofilo sotto nome di Merlino Pitocho stampò uno libro detto l'Orlandino in ottava rima, con di molte heresie. Qual libro infin qui, io non ho potuto ritrovare: Ma intendendo dal R.P. Inquisitore dovere uscire un altro Indice, non ho voluto differire più, in avisare di quanto mi raccordo prima che si stampi; offerendomi ritrovato detto libro, avisare più ampiamente. Il libro è per gente bassa, et il non ritrovare in Padova mi dà sospetto, che fu avuto da molti, essendovene già 16 o 18 anni, ch' fu ~~st~~ ristampato in Venetia molta copia. Mi raccordo donche primieramente che egli dice male delle orationi di Santi, conciosii che prima, che S. Pietro vadi dalla porta del cielo a ritrovare Christo a esporre le nostre orationi, l'huomo perisce. Et perch'el tristo conosceva la impietà sua soggionge questi versi.

101 Added by another hand.

1. Et perché i Capuzzati non m'annasino cioè gl'Inquisitori
Io credo in tutto el credo, e se non vale
Io credo anco in quel del dottrinale.

2. De' legati fatti alle Chiese, et delle orationi della chiesa dice.
O pazzi & fuorsensati che voi seti
Ch'el vostro haver lasciati a frati & preti.
Per dire ch'in Giesia un sol parli, et altre parole, che non ricordo

3. Delle legge et Constitutioni humane, el parlava delle monastiche
Io non tacer, acciò tu non mi dij
[Là] dove spesso mi forbisce e netta
Liber novarum legum, quem de foeno
Quidam composuerunt, ventre pleno. Burlasi della Canonica poi.

4. Non tanta commentaria sopra il sesto
Decreti, Decretali, et pisanelle
aedificarunt fratres et sorelle
Quanta [facea] Milon etc. il resto non mi ricordo.

5. Del studio della Teologia dice
Et durante il freno mastico a credere
Che con la dottrina Aristotelica
Habisi a predicare l'evangelica.

6. Della vita monastica rispondendo a una sua interrogatione perché causa egli aveva apostato, con parole indegne delle orecchie di V.S. Illustrissimma dice questo hemisticho:
[Io ratto gli rispondo,] Domine ita,
Che mi duol d'esser stato a cotal vita.

Ne V.S. Illma iscusarà (penso) le parole di costui, quando egli era tanto a Erasmo affezionato, quanto si vanta in detto libro. Della dottrina del quale, mi pare, questa di Merlino. Ne da piacevolezza, anzi da spirito impio in tutto questo e nella Maccarronea stessa, traduce tanto il nome, costumi, et institutioni di religiosi, che ~~prope~~ pro[ro]mpe… in dire

7. Nonne satis bastat sapientis regula Christi.

Dal medesimo spirito finge ch'el coltello di Cinziano facesse miracoli, et ch'era quello di Santo Bartolomeo. Agiongesi (ne credo ingannarmi), che sendo giovinetto intesi da nostri Padri vecchi, che egli si fuggì per esser stato ritrovato in certa stanza con certi giovani a trattar di queste tal dottrine quali tutti si fugirno. ne (come dico) la memoria si inganna, non ci havendo in questo passione alcuna. Ha oltre stampato l'humanità di Christo (in 8° rima) quale non ho mai veduta. Il Triperuno o Chaos. Volgare, latino, maccaronesco. Verso, prosa. Materie di Teologia di mille altri caprizii del quale per averlo letto già 24 anni sono, non mi raccordo nulla. D. Gio. Battista il Fratello lo fece sepelire apartatamente in Campese loco di S.ta Benedetta di Mantua con uno epitafio, quale non mi raccordo.

Et perché V.S. sa benissimo como io, et gl'altri denoncianti siamo trattati, la prego fare in modo, che non si avedano questi nostri Reverendi di questo mio aviso. Massime in evento, che facessino levar l'epitafio. Tanto più, che questo agosto prossimo passato in una loro Congregatione fecisi intendere, che saria bene, che essi avisassino il Santissimo Offitio di questo Orlandino. Intesi, che non parve loro di farlo. Et colui, che (tra essi) si usurpa il Corifeo et el dottore mostromi non <. . .> a bene, con dire, che non tocca a lui fare queste Censure; faccianle chi ne ha l'uffitio. Basta a me (disse) se, i miei monaci haveranno di torglilo. Parola, che mi stomacò, et mi parve non degna di buono christiano. Ne mi maraviglio, se è stato sempre così mal affetto a denoncianti. Nostro Signor conservi longa et felicemente V.S. Illustrissima nel suo santo servitio et essa si degni havermi per humilmente raccolto et così con riverenza gli bacio le sante mani.

El P. . . . Gio. Antonio milanese de chierici regolari gli domanda la sua santa beneditione e io insieme.
di Padova li 4. dicembre 1573
Di V.S. Ill.ma & R.ma
affettuosissimo

D. Germano monaco di santa Giustina di Padova

1.9 Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*

Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* appears as a prohibited work and *nominatim* for the first time on local blacklists: "Il Cortegiano expurg." was included in the *Nota de libri prohibiti, et di alcuni sospesi* (according to *ILI*, ix dating from c. 1580), *Annotatio librorum prohibitorum, et eorum qui suspensi fuerunt usque*

ad novam expurgationem Santissime Universalis Inquisitionis preter eos qui continentur in Indice Generali edicto sacri Concilii Tridentini decreto (Alessandria, 1580) and the work without any reference to an expurgation appears in the *Index* of Parma in 1580.[102] An unpublished internal list among files held at the Vatican Library, *Libri quorum usum interdicendum est*, mentions the work among books which should be prohibited. This list dates from earlier than the above blacklists but later than 1573, perhaps from 1574. A brief note explains that many parts are to be amended ("Liber, vulgo conscriptus, il Cortegiano, multis locis emendandus").[103]

An expurgated edition was prepared by Antonio Ciccarelli and published in Venice in 1584 by Bernardo Basa.[104] On the basis of the general *Rules* of the *Index* of 1564, Vittorio Cian has suggested that it was inevitable that *Il Cortegiano* attracted the attention of the Roman censorial authorities. Although the *Rules* did not require an explicit prohibition, he apparently denied the possibility that the work was prohibited before 1580.[105] However, Cian quotes a manuscript annotation made to an Aldine edition of 1545 according to which the work was expurgated prior to 1580:

> . . . nuovamente ristampato e riformato conforme all'ordine degl'Illustrissimi e Reverendissimi Cardinali dell'Inquisizione di Roma: le annotazioni della qual riforma furono mandate dal molto illustre signor Claudio (*sic, leggasi invece Scipione*) Gonzaga da Roma sotto gli 8 ottobre 1576, e arrivarono in Mantova ai 27 novembre 1576 procurate dal molto illustre signor conte Camillo Castiglione: e detta riforma fu finita e riportata sopra un altro volume, simile a questo a' X aprile 1577 e fu confermata dal Reverendo Padre Inquisitore di Mantova.

Cian explains that the expurgation was prepared from 1576 to 1577 and confirmed by the Roman Inquisition but that it was then forgotten.[106] The above annotation raises the question of why it links this expurgation to a reformed print edition that does not seem to be the one prepared by Ciccarelli. It may be that there is another expurgated print edition that has not yet been identified. This question draws attention to the two above blacklists, which include the

102 *ILI*, ix, 749, 751 and 753; cf. Coseriu, 90. She refers also to another one of uncertain origin (1575–1589).

103 Vatican, BAV, Vat. Lat. 6207, 218r–9r.

104 Cf. Cian.

105 Ibid. 667–8.

106 Ibid. 668.

entry "Il Cortegiano expurg." One could assume that "expurg." stands for "expurgatus," but this edition cannot be Ciccarelli's correction which appeared later in 1584. A comparison to other entries in the blacklists may take us further.

A planned expurgation was indicated with the very typical and clear formula "donec expurgentur": for instance, "Gasparis Contareni opuscula de Sacramentis, et iustificatione suspensa donec expurgentur." By contrast, the expression "expurg." is also used for Folengo's *Opus macaronicum*, and in 1561 an edition had been published that claimed to be expurgated, so it would be plausible to read it as "expurgatus." On these grounds, *Nota* and *Annotatio* seem to refer to a print edition of the *Cortegiano* that claimed to have been expurgated prior to 1584. Otherwise both lists are wrong. One plausible explanation could be that the entries refer to the expurgation carried out in 1576/77.

But *Il Cortegiano* raises even more questions. The censorship prepared at Perugia (1.7g) deals with three editions that appeared earlier than 1584: Venice: Girolamo Cavalcanti, Lyons: Guillaume Rouillé, 1550 and Venice: Gabriel Giolito 1556. This may be an indication that the document from Perugia was composed before the expurgated edition appeared, that is, before 1584. In that case it might even have contributed to the case, or possibly its author was not aware that the work had already been corrected or he tried to draw attention to unexpurgated editions that were circulating illegally. The latter explanation would match an entry of the *Index* of 1590, which tried to impede the circulation and printing of uncorrected editions: "Balt. Castellonei liber qui inscribitur Il Cortegiano, nisi fuerit ex emendatis et impressis Ven. 1584."[107]

See also 1.7g.

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. A², 282r

Expurgatus ab Hyspano in fol. pag 78 (B 3)
Errori nel Cortigiano del Castiglione in revisto per Lodovico Dolce stampato in Lione appresso Guglielmo Rovillio 1562.[108]

Facie 4 post medium, come cosa divina
Facie 16 Cum principium. L'unico Aretino
Facie 30 post principium, dottrina di fra Mariano <. . .>
di fra Seraphino
Facie 35 in fine, con la sua divina virtù etc.
Facie 58. post principium, a chi nasce aggraciato non accadono ammaestramenti etc.

107 Ibid., 667.

108 In marg.: "libro E pagina 74 / libro O pagina 672."

Facie 61 post principium, lassando quelli che dalle stelle l'hanno
Facie 65 ante medium, fra Serafino non lieva le mani da tavola <…> notata usque ad fol.

1.10 Novelle and Fairy Tales

An anonymous, undated document contains brief, radical censorships of novelle and tale collections of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Vatican, ACDF, XVIII Index, 205r–v). They concern Giovan Francesco Straparola's *Notti piacevoli*, the *Cento novelle* published by Francesco Sansovino, the *Novelle Porretane* by Giovanni Sabadino degli Arienti, Matteo Bandello's *Novelle*, Girolamo Parabosco's *I Diporti* and *Il Pecorone* by Giovanni Fiorentino.

In order to date this document, it is helpful to find out more about the official prohibition of these works. Straparola, Sansovino, Bandello, Giovanni Fiorentino and Parabosco are on Constabile's May *Aviso* of 1574 and reappear in the *Annotatio librorum prohibitorum, et eorum qui suspensi fuerunt* (Alessandria, 1580). I have not found Sabadino's *Porretane* on a blacklist prior to 1580 (*Index* of Parma). These dates could indicate that the censorship was written after 1580.[109] Bonardo refers to the planned expurgation of his discourse of 1587, and this document contains instructions for an expurgation, so it may belong to this period or even the 1590s, as some entries in later *Indexes* suggest.

Sansovino's novelle figure in the *Indexes* of 1590 and 1593 along with his letters and *Historia universal dell'origine et imperio de Turchi* (1590: "quandiu ex earundem regularum ratione non corrigantur." 1593: "se non saranno emendate), and the *Avvertimenti, avvedimenti civili e concetti politici di M. Francesco Guicciardini, di M Gio. Francesco Lottini, di M Francesco Sansovino*" are on the *Index* of 1593 ("se prima non saranno emendati").[110] Straparola's novelle should be expurgated according to the *Index* of 1590 (letter *I*, second class), although they reappear under the letter *N* in the second class together with Bandello's novelle, and this time the expurgation is not mentioned. In 1593 the expurgation is again indicated for both Sansovino and Bandello.[111] Parabosco's *I Diporti* are on the *Indexes* of 1590 and 1593, waiting for expurgation. His letters appear in the *Index* of 1590, along with unspecified letters of Alvise Pasqualigo, and as an author he is listed in the section of music books (*Libri de Musica*) of Parma's

109 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 750–1, cf. the documents on the Sistine expurgation project in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. A.

110 *ILI*, ix, 815, 908, 906.

111 Ibid. 826, 836, 909.

Index of 1580.[112] Giovanni Fiorentino's *Pecorone* was included in the *Indexes* in 1590 and 1593, though without a reference to an expurgation.[113]

The manuscript *Index* series of the Archive of the Congregation for the Index, which contains numerous documents on the *Index* and censorships, is not organized systematically. It is therefore risky to base the dating of a document on dates of other documents contained in the same codex (*Index* XVIII). Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that these documents, such as inventories of archives of prohibited books from local Inquisitions, stem from the late 1590s. Among them is the above inventory of archived prohibited books at the Inquisition of Ancona, which lists Straparola's *Notti piacevoli*.[114] Moreover, the spelling of the name "Gio*v*anni Sabadino" with a Z and without a V: "Zoanni Sabadino" could be an indication of the author's or scribe's origin, perhaps from a northern region around Venice. In addition, there is a letter from Cardinal Valier to the inquisitor of Padua in which the inquisitor is instructed to provide for the expurgation of books on philosophy and medicine, keep a careful eye on the book market, and defer the correction of Straparola and letters by Niccolò Franco. The correction of Straparola was on the schedule of the Inquisition of Padua in 1597:

> Molto Reverendo Padre. Essendo commesso a Monsignor Vescovo con l'intervento di Vostra Reverenza et de Theologi et aiuto di tanti Dottori che sono in sì honorato studio l'espurgatione de libri di filosofia e Medicina negotio di grand'importanza, però con Monsignor attenderete con ogni diligenza a sollecitar l'impresa e tralasciar le lettere del Franco e *Notti* del Straparola, e far attendere con diligenza alla stampa et haver l'occhio a libri che vengono di fuori e dar aviso. Con che fine alli 26 di Dicembre 1597. Il Cardinale di Verona.[115]

This is no proof that the anonymous document is from Padua, but it could be possible. The letter dates from 26 December 1597, that is, the same period in which several documents of the codex were written.

Vatican, ACDF, XVIII Index, 205r–v

Le Censure, che noi habbiamo qua sono le infrascritte <. . .>[116]

---

112 Ibid. 820, 907, 829, 838, 908, 753.

113 Ibid. 826, 910.

114 *Nota de libri prohibiti, et sospesi che si trovano nell'Inquisizione d'Ancona*, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XVIII, 48r.

115 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. V (1582–1602), 79v.

116 This transcription reproduces only excerpts.

1.10a Straparola's *Notti piacevoli*

Censura nel Libro delle Novelle di Francesco Strapparola.

E prima dalla prima notte par che si dovesse togliere la favola 3 et 5.
Dalla notte 6 la favola 4 et 5.
Dalla notte 7 favola 3.
Dalla notte 9 favola 4.
Dalla notte 12 favola 3 et 5.
Dalla notte 13 favola 8, 9 et 11.

1.10b Sansovino's *Cento novelle*

Dalle Cento novelle di m. Francesco Sansovino.

Dalla prima giornata la novella 10.
Dalla 3 giornata novella 5.
Dalla 4 giornata novella 3 et 6.
Dalla 5 giornata novella 5.
Dalla ottava giornata novella 2.
Dalla 9 giornata novella 2.
Dalla 10 giornata novella 8.

1.10c Sabadino's *Novelle Porretane*

Dalle 70 Novelle di m. Zoanni Sabadini dette *Porretane* paiono sospette queste.

La prima l'8 la 12, 13, 14, 18, 17, 19, 40, 46, 47, 55, et 56.

1.10d Bandello's *Novelle*

Novelle del Bandella. [sic]

Dalla prima parte novella 6, 9, 30, 32, 34, 35, 38, 58.
Dalla 2 parte novella prima, 2, 3, 4, 6, 20, 23, 24, 30, 39, 45, et 48.
La 3 parte tutta cattiva.
Dalla 4 parte novella 2, 6, 20.

Dalla 5 parte novella prima, 8, 10, 12, 14, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 49, 55, 56, 61, 63.

1.10e Parabosco's *I Diporti*

I Diporti del Parabosco, par che habbiano bisogno, che li siano tolte

la novella prima, 12, 14, 17.

1.10f Giovanni Fiorentino's *Il Pecorone*

Il Pecorone di S. Giovanni Fiorentino ha bisogno di emendatione in questo che fa contare tutte le sue novelle da un frate, et una monaca, che erano innamorate insieme, ilche sta male.

Di più sono appresso di noi bisognosi di Censure ancora gl'infrascritti libri, e da noi ritenuti. (See 1.10g–i)

1.10g Della Casa's *Le Terze Rime*

Le terze rime di Giovanni Della Casa per essercene molte di dishoneste.

1.10h Manfredi's *Opera nova intitolata Il perché*

Libro del Perché stampato in Venetia nel 1520 [Alessandro Bindoni], perché contiene molte cose di chiromantia.

1.10i Nicolò Aurifico Bonfigli's *Selva di orationi*

Selva di Orationi di Nicolao Aurifico, perché contengono li salmi penitentiali volgari, et il passio di S. Giovanni.

1.11 Collections of Vernacular Letters

An extensive but anonymous and undated document deals with vernacular letter collections, namely the *Nuovo libro de lettere delli più rari autori della*

lingua volgare italiana published in Venice by Paolo Gherardo in 1545 (1.11c), the *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini et eccellentissimi ingegni* published in 1550 (1.11b) and 1551 (1.11a) by the sons of Aldo in Venice and the *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini, et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie, con la giunta del terzo libro, nuovamente ristampate, et in più luoghi corrette. Libro primo* (Venice: Paolo Manuzio, 1564) (1.11d).[117] The Manuzio collection of 1551 was also censored by the Inquisition of Perugia. The Inquisition criticized the same lascivious letters by Annibale Caro and Boccaccio that had been censored by the anonymous author. I have not found these editions on the Roman blacklists, but the section *Libri volgari sospetti* (letter *L*) of the *Index* of Di Dio contains the entry: "3 Lettere di diversi Nobilissimi Venet. 1515 et 1516 prius corrigantur."[118] A similar entry, again for another edition, can be traced in the *Index* of Parma of 1580: "Lettere di diversi nobilissimi huomini, Venetia 1567, prius corrigantur."[119]

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. F, 38v–43r

Annotata super vulgares litteras

1.11a *Lettere volgari* I

In libro qui inscribitur Lettere volgare [sic] di diversi nobilissimi huomini, sub Aldi signo, impresso Venetiis 1551.

Carta 4. Lorenzo Medici. Conosco che andando voi a Roma, che è sentina di tutti mali. E più oltra. S'i Cardinali fussino come doverebbeno essere, perciò che farebbono sempre un buon Papa.

E più oltra. Lo stato del Cardinale è non manco sicuro, che grande, onde nasce, che gli huomini si fanno negligenti, parendo loro haver conseguito assai.

Carta 14. Annibale Caro. Quella mi tenga manco amorevole servidore conoscendola lontana dalle superstitioni della più parte di prelati, che fanno più stima delle ceremonie, che degli cuori degli huomini.

Carta 52. Il Guidiccione. Tanto desidero io ciò, quanto voi di venire a Roma, dove venuto spero, (colpa del corutto vivere di questi preti) che conoscerete, che fedelmente vene ho sconsigliato, conciosia cosa che io non pensi che

117 Paolo Manuzio, see note 749, and Antonio Manuzio (ed.), *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini, et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie* (Venice: Aldo, 1550), second book dedicated to Paolo Tron, fu del Magnifico messer Santo.

118 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. XIV.

119 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 753.

l'animo vostro non sia per refutare quello, che il mio disdegna, et odia, ciò è tante sceleraggini, quante non sono nel resto del mondo.

E più oltra, perciò che non solamente da questi illustri per ricchezze non si può havere, ma non se puote ancora sperare premio, che sia di lunghe fatiche, o, di rischio di morte, si l'huomo non si revolge ad acquistar per vie dishoneste, perciò ch'essi non carezzano, e non essaltano, se non adulteri,[120] e quelli che sanno per alphabeto l'habitationi, le prattiche e le qualità di cortigiane, non vogliono vedersi avanti, si non quelli che loro parlano di buoni cibi, e di vini, quelli che sanno trovare più secreti, anzi più aperte vie, non dico solamente d'aquistar danari per via ordinaria, ma di vendere i benefici, non fanno grate accoglienze e fatti, se non a quelli li quali con più colorate scuse sanno torre loro dalle spalle i creditori, benché poverissimi, et mancar di fede il giorno tante volte.

E più oltra. però conoscendomi huomo, non voglio far più esperienza della mia virtù, ma voglio lasciar questa Babilonia, la quale io non mi maraviglio che li barbari habbiano saccheggiata, et in molti luoghi guasta, ma maraviglia-reimi io bene, s'havessero fatto altrimente, e maravigliomi hora, che indugi tanto a venir maggior flagello.

Carta 85 et 86. Annibale Caro. Due lettere d'amore lascive.

Carta 105. Boccaccio. Una lettera d'amore lasciva.

Carta 107. Francesco Petrarcha. Non vi disse io insino dal principio che il Papa non farebbe nulla di quelle tante proferte? Ecco che io ho un'arte più, che altri non crede, che io so anche indovinare, e così saprei sempre ne i fatti loro, troppo ne so gran maestro per lunga prova, così il conoscessi meco il populo christiano, che sarebbe in meglior stato il mondo, che non è, hor non più di questo, che non paia, ch'io mi sia corrucciato, che non sono, anzi me ne fò beffe.

Carta 118. Antonio Broccardo. Promesi a V.S. di farla avisata del giuditio, che fece l'amico che ne predisse la sorte, e giurovi per tutto l'amore che è tra noi, che li profeti del testamento vecchio li più veri sono stati favole a rispetto suo, e quanto a l'amico di cui ci disse che giaceva nel letto ammalato, era più che l'evangelio.

Carta 129. Il Bonfadio. O, m. Camillo infelice, donque sete fatto chietino! mi diceva già un buon compagno in Roma, che Preti e Frati erano predoni, e fraudi. di quelli è l'audatia, di questi è l'astutia, le quali disunite benché noceno, pur non nocion molto, hor sono comparsi questi corpi misti dell'una e de l'altra, che se gli habbia fabbricati, sasselo, che tanto sa, agiuteci domenedio a questo tratto.

120 Manuzio: *adulatori*.

1.11b *Lettere volgari* II

In secondo libro carta 23 (=22v)[121]

Claudio Tholomei. M. Bartholomeo Paganucci con un suo nuovo incanto m'ha cavate di man, non so che lettere, e poi s'è fatto prete, e se ne va a Trento al Concilio. Io son entrato in una gran gelosia di questo suo fatto, e mi rendo certo, e lo giurarei, ch'egli non ne vuol far altro, se non mandarvele, perché voi li stampiate, s'egli ve le manda, io n'ho un gran dispiacere, perché primamente io non vorrei che si stampasseno, e dopo che s'elle pur sono condemnate a questa morte, vorrei che almeno havessero inanzi l'olio, e la raccomandatione dell'anima, acciò che non se ne andassero perdute al fuoco maledetto.

Carta 60 (= 59v). Il vescovo Giovio. Signor mio Honorandissimo, venendo di ritorno costi, li signori stuffi delle stationi di Roma.

Carta 66. Galeazzo Florimonte. Et non mi maraviglio molto, che quella facci l'ufficio di Simone, essendo già posto tanto in uso, che si può quasi dir naturale il dare il temporale per il spirituale nelle corti di Cardinali.

Carta 69. Marc'antonio bendidio. Una lettera amorosa.

1.11c *Lettere volgari* III

In libro, qui inscribitur, Nuovo libro de Lettere delli più rari autori della lingua volgare Italiana. In Venetia per Paolo Gherardo. 1545. hi continentur errores.

Carte 10. Pietro Bembo. Pone la morte del suo Fratello sotto augurij.

Carte 14. Ludovico Domenichi. Io vi giuro per il maggior membro del nostro Dio, giuramento più solenne, che per la cavezza dell'Imperadore.

Carte 15. Giacomo Bonfadio. Due belle compositioni mi sono capitate nelle mani, una del varchi, che è una lettione sopra il 25. capitolo del purgatorio di Dante, l'altra è del Caro, che è un tributo della vertù sopra la statua della Foia, o vero di Santa Nafissa

Carte 28. Camillo Caula. verso il fine. Ecco che la penitenza vera non consiste in dire con la parola non gli intravenendo il consenso del cuore, io mi pento, e duolmi haver peccato, ne anco nel numero degli anni, non sta ne i degiuni, non sta nel vestire, ne in l'afflittione della carne, ma solo nell'amaritudine dell'animo, e nel rammarico, e cruciato della mente.

---

121 Antonio Manuzio (ed.), *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini, et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie* (Venice: Aldo, 1550).

Carte 34. La Marchesa di Pescara. Il Principio dell'Epistola diversi sensi può havere.

Carte 35. l'istessa. Che solo all'infinito figlio è di poco inferiore l'eterna Madre.

Carte 44. Francesco della Torre. Per l'arbitrio della fortuna che ha sopra le cose humane.

Carte 53. Il Doni. Dal principio. Al sangue del nostro Iddio è per tutto molte rabaldarie.

Carte 58. Lodovico Dolce. dal principio. Lodando il morto fratello del Patriarca d'Aquilegia, dice, che'l mondo non hebbe mai né il più religioso, né il più giusto, né il più amorevole di lui.

Carte 60. Giulio Camillo. Pone il nome di Locretia per Cabala, servendosi della scrittura malamente.

Carte 67. L'istesso al medesimo. afferma nell'anima rationale non poter cadere né passione, né tristezza.

Carte 70. L'istessa lettera. Mentre mi rivolgete, tanto del ben di Dio, et nel corpo di V. Illu. S. è nell'anima sua virtuosissima, perché non mi posso io chiamare santo, certo io non pur son santo, ma santissimo.

Carte 82. Lodovico dolce [sic]. nel fine. Et se de costi è alcun predicatore, che predichi il vero senza rispetto, ascoltandolo voi com'io penso, serbatene qualche particella per me.

85. Lodovico dolce. nel fine. I preti io gli ho sono pur di grandi asini, voi avete hora l'essempio, e desidero d'intendere una severa giustitia.

88. Giovan Pietro detto di Vito. Non basta portar zoccoli, barba lunga, et collo torto ad essere huomo da bene, no. O quello il fò, perché prima per mezzo della nostra terra passava l'acqua. Hora che non vi passa? Per portar i pie asciutti, per imitar i vestiggi paterni, questo, perché così me l'ha concesso la natura, et vado secondo il naturale. Ma non nel resto ne gl'imitate [sic] in questo.

Carte 103. Gian Luca Benedetto, Ebolitano. Talché se Esculapio, et Hipocrate, per non dire come a superstitioso, S. Cosmo, e Damiano, ritornassero in vita, havrebbe caro d'esservi discepoli, non che compagni.

Carte 111. Il Mutio. 15. Per arte magica si può egli piegar la durezza de gli animi altrui? in questo li scrittori naturali dicono, de sì, i Theologi christiani dicono di no, io tra loro non ho da dar sentenza, ma da creder quello, che mi detta la ragione, e così dovete far voi.

Carte 114. Alfonso da Este Duca di Ferrara. E ch'el Papa con la magior parte de Cardinali et oratori era fugito in Castello sant'Angiolo, hoc est in pregione, et chel predetto essercito Cesareo haveva fatto grandissima occisione. soggionge. voglio ch'in nome mio andiate a congratularvi con la Maestà

Cesarea, ch'Iddio l'habbia eletto per suo ministro, et essecutore, e se sia servito del braccio di sua altezza a far cose tanto memorande.

Carte 128. Il vescovo Vergerio alla Regina di Navarra. lettera Eretica.

Carte 136. Benedetto Volpe. Et che fu più menzogna ch'Orpheo cavasse dalle pene dell'Inferno Euridice, o, s. Gregorio Nerva Traiano Volpe Imperadore, padre del disavolo del Avolo mio. Nel fine. e della brevità mia, date la colpa a l'esser sonato a Messa, e l'esser Dominica, ch'io vi vado per non parer heretico.

Carte 137. Luigi Raimondi. Le vostre lettere nell'Accademia nostra piacquero a tutti più che non piace il requiem eternam [sic] a i frati. Ma quel darvi per il capo del prete, et il volerlo far chiaro al mondo che sete, e quello ch'al giudicio dell'Accademia, ha (come dice il Giovio) guastato la coda al fagiano, per saper in qual preggio siano hoggi dì li preti.

Carte 138. Lodovigo Domenichi. Egli è stato spirato dalla misericorda di Dio a far elettione dell'ottima parte, dico del sacro santo matrimonio, e lasciar la mal secura, e molto pericolosa vita de cherico [, me ne rallegro con tutto'l core, et con ogni affetto dell'animo con la Signoria vostra, et prego Iddio, che le prosperi così santo, felice, et riposato instituto.][122] E la faccia contenta ne i cari frutti di sì lodato sacramento, poi ché per gratia sua l'ha tratta da i pericoli, da i lacci, e dalle reti che stavano intorno all'anima sua, reducendola a vera, et indubitata speranza della salute eterna.

Carte 140. Dionigi Rosso del Levano. Egli, sì come dalla sua prima fanciullezza honestamente visse, così nella sua ultima vecchiezza honestamente morì in quel ultimo suo termine, non che in quello havesse posto la speranza non mancando della sua salute, che solo nella morte de christo s'havea messa, ma per giustificarsi appò le genti del mondo, non mancando dico di ecclesiastica ceremonia veruna. E più al basso: Passò di questa vita contento, contrito, confessato, sodisfatto e de i beni, et de tutte le pietà di sacramenti.

Carte 149. G. Battista Vergerio. Vescovo di Pola l'istesso a carte 154 et a carte. 155.

Carte 155. Hercole Bentivoglio. dicovi per hora che personarum non est acceptor Deus, et Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri, e tutti ci salviamo con la fede, per la infinita misericordia di Dio, e la virtù della passione di Jesu Christo crocifisso.

Carte 164, 165, 166, 167, 168. Annibal Caro a Bernardo Spina scrive una lettera tutta in dispreggio, e dishonore di questo nome Frate, con dir moltissimi mali.

122 The words in brackets are not quoted in the censorship and were added by me.

Carte 105. Giovanni Boccaccio a M. Pino de' Rossi in 15. carte scrive una lettera biasmando il governo di Fiorentini, e trattando della Avaritia, dice, per questo di nostri Priori nuovamente sono cominciati a farsi vescovi, ne dubito, che si ben nel passato si fusse guardato, n'havesse molto più mitriati la nostra corte queste oltre a tutto questo sono quelle, per le quali, o, perché perdute, o, in parte diminuite sieno, et intollerabile da nostra sciagura tenuta, quasi senza esse ne servar l'honor mondano, ne allevar le fameglie si possano, ingannato è chi così crede.

Libro Terzo.

Carte 17. Francesco della Torre al Prothonotario Carnisecca. L'istesso nella seguente senza soprascrittione parlando della morte del detto Protonotario Carnisecca, come facilmente se può nel fine comprendere si ben no'l nomina, dice. Monsignor, se n'è ito a godere in effetto quel bene che tanto tempo ha desiderato, e sperato, rallegramoci della felicità sua, e se pur vogliamo dolerci, dogliamci di noi stessi, e della miseria nostra, pregando N.S. Iddio che faccia a noi la gratia ch'ha fatta a sua Santità.

Carte 27. Fra Francesco a M. Ubaldino Bandinello. Lettera non conveniente.

Carte 28. et 29. Due lettere di Ferrante de Trotti a Monsignor Carnesecchi, in una scrive della andata di detto Monsignor in Roma, dicendo, è come a guisa di nebbia dinanzi al sole, così a l'apparir suo si sono dileguate tutte le false imputationi.

Carte 31. Il Cardinale de' Medici, che fu Papa Clemente scrive al Clarissimo Signor Giorgio Cornaro di voler far le sue prattiche per essere Pontefice, e prega detto Signor vogli scrivere al Reverendissimo Cardinale Cornaro lo vogli favorir a farlo Pontefice.

Carte 48. Il Valerio, a Mons.r Carnisecca.

Carte 49. Il Molza. Vi mando due sonetti, i quali io tengo per molto plebei, avvenga che siano creati nel paradiso terrestre, se vi parranno tali, che si possano monstrar all'Illustrissima Marchesa la quale io adoro, e inchino come cosa santa fate voi.

Carte 71. Marc'Antonio Giusto al Protonotario Carnisecca. Sia benedetta da Iddio sua Beatitudine insieme con l'Illustrissimo et Eccellentissimo Cardinale Farnese, i quali a mal grado di Malvagi hanno illustrato con la loro singolare benignità la innocenza di V.S. e così Idio fa vedere, che anchora in questo modo talhora gli huomini più per la via della falsa infamia pervengono a magior grado d'honore, e di gloria, che certamente non so vedere qual maggior honore potesse esserle fatto, che quello che l'ha fatto. Sua

Santità rendendo così illustre testimonianza alla sua virtù, cosa veramente degna del suo animo heroico.

Carte 78. Francesco Greco.

Carte 80. Il Vescovo di Pola.

Carte 101. Il Protonotario Carnisecchi.

Carte 116. Cirillo a Camillo Olivo. Che diavolo ha da far la messa co'l'huomo armato, ne con Filomena, ne co'l Duca di Ferrara.

Carte 144. Il vescovo di Sessa scrive a un Illustrissimo Cardinale dicendoli, che molti Cardinali vanno mascarati per Roma, ma che lui tolto totalmente la maschera va con habiti secolareschi, et altre reprensioni.

Carte 147. L'istesso, senza soprascrittione, riprende un prelato che haveva da 50 Parocchiali, et uno Illustrissimo Cardinale defendendolo disse, che non haveva se non cinque, ma pareva haverne assai, per pigliarle per questo, e quel altro per compiacere, e sopra ciò riprende, e bene, ma non sta bene in stampa.

Carte 174. Il vescovo di Sessa. Quel vescovo disse che sarebbe meglio per i populi, che i vescovi non si mandassero a i loro vescovati, credo che sia quel frate di san Domenico, che predicando in Bologna de Conceptione Virginis contra l'oppinion di Santo Tomaso, referendo il dire del Demonio, nominò l'Angiolo Gabriello per nome di fantescone, et perché il Caterino col quale esso era unito scrisse come sapete, quae residentia non est de jure divino. esso come suo sequace fa l'ufficio e non vede quanti mali nascono dalla non residenza. chi non sa che si sono trovati de i Papi giocatori, biastematori, scandalosi, et vitiosissimi. diremo per questo, che Papatus non sit de iure divino? quanti Cardinali sono stati infami, deposti, et ammazzati per le loro ribalderie? resta per questo, che la institution di Cardinali non sia buona, e santa? sel Santo Dio inspirasse i Papi che non dessero Vescovati a chi li dimanda, non dico a chi prega, serve et paga per haverli, non si trovarebbono vescovi giocatori, com'egli dice, ne meno scandalosi, se sua santità mandasse i Commissarii a visitare le Diocesi per informarsi della vita di Vescovi, e poi premiasse, o, punisse secondo i meriti, non direbbe quel nemico della residenza, che sarebbe meglio, che i vescovi non stessero ne loro vescovati, et che voce horrenda fu quella di collui che disse, che non haveva gratie a Christo del suo vescovato? Et non fuerunt inventi homines timorati, vel potius stomacati, qui iacerent in eum lapides?

Carte 129. Antonio Brocardo. più a basso. Pur havendolo detto il nostro profeta, et essendomi di molto magior contentezza il creder che sia così, che'l far l'ostinato, lo crederò, stando con ferma speranza di tosto veder etiamdio il marito uscito del tutto di questa vita, sì come ce disse che havrebbe, il che accadendo, come agevolmente potrebbe, lasciando Ieremia, Isaia, e quanti

antichi furno già mai, solamente nelli moderni son per credere, e già non vi potrei credere più, ritrovando più che vero quello che c'è stato profetato.

Carte 139. Prete meo. lettera non conveniente a un Prete.

Carte 140. Il Bonfadio. Io ho desinato hor hora un gran piatto de fichi da Bardolino, tutte quasi somigliavano a voi, non m'intendete per aventura? ch'havevano il collo torto, o m. Camillo infelice <. . .>

Nel Libro Secondo.

A Carte XI. Giacomo Bonfadio. nel fine. Né pensarò del passato o del future, che quel ch'è stato, fu, e quel ch'ha da essere, non può mancare, del presente mi goderò senza pensieri, né pur pensando a questo, amando la negligenza, e quella anco negligentemente.

Carte 12. L'Istesso a Monsignor Carnisecchi. L'huomo di cui V.S. mi scrive, dalla corte portò seco odio verso di me, generato da la superbia sua, e qui l'accrebbe poi per malignità, rasi ha i supercigli, e non ride mai, se non alcuni freddi, e simulati ghigni, onde a pena credo che chi può ogni cosa, potesse far che costui fusse buono, e seque.

Carte 46. Il Marchese del Vasto, scrive a Pietro Aretino non vogli mancar di scrivere li vitij d'altri.

Carte 49. Antonio Brocardo carnificio, e falconismo con cera comprante violae alla Signora Marietta Mirtilla. Lettera non molto honesta, e più della metà scritta in zergo.

Carte 53. Due lettere di Francesco della Torre a Monsignor Carnesecchi.

Carte 54. Il vescovo Giovio. A Mons.r Carnisecchi. Venendo questi Signori stuffi dalle stationi di Roma, ho voluto far questa credentiale a M.G. Michele, il quale mi promette che farà chiara V. Signoria come il Giovio l'è immortale Signore e così se congratularà del suo ben stare, e narrerà, come io sudo più che mai al fumo della lucerna per dare conto a posteri di queste trami del ladro mondo. V.S. mi tenga adunque per tal servitore come dipingerà dal vero Signor Michele, e dignarassi di commandarmi, perché io mi sto in forma antica in gratia di padre figlio e Spirito Santo e vagliamo pur qualche cosa di quello si stimano le melarancie verdi.

Carte 60. Galeazzo Florimonte a M. Galasso Ariosto. S'io hebbi mai quella lettera, per la quale voi mi scrivesti della perigrinatione del mio scartabello, ch'io venga in odio al Reverendissimo di Ferrara, della cui benevolenza mi glorio più che non fa N. del suo Cappello rosso, che certo se l'havesse havuta, non harei tardato a scrivere. Direi ben io d'havervi scritto, e resposto. Ma che? Non empiamo le carte di querele, voi m. Galasso havete poco carità verso di me, che si havesti cura dell'anima mia, non m'haveresti mandato

quella lettera del Reverendissimo di Ferrara diretta a voi in compagnia di quella diretta a me, quasi adens oleum camino. E qual desperato cappuccino si terrebbe dentro di se? Sentendosi tanto lodare.

Carte 82. Il Vigerio.

Carte 87. Jacomo Grifolo sanese, e quando verrete a Roma, giudicarete alcuni prelati maggior bestie, che le sue mule.

Carte 191. Lodovico Domenichi a Pietro Aretino: ch'io non mi tengo però così da poco, che non potesse fare con poca fatica una metamorphosi ordinaria, verbi gratia, transformandomi di buon christiano, in cattivo prete.

Carte 196. Isabella Sforza al Signor Lodovico Domenichi. Ito da poi visto la bellissima traduttione del libro di santo Agostino la qual spero, che sarà utile a molti, Benedetto sia il Signor Dio, il qual le prestarà gratia, che con le sue fatiche si finiranno d'apriori queste fenestre, che tanto tempo ci sono state chiuse.

1.11d *Lettere volgari* III

In libro qui inscribitur Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi Huomini, et Eccellentissimi Ingegni, con la giunta del 3° libro. In Venetia 1564, Aldus.

Carte 3. Lorenzo de' Medici, al magnifico Giovanni de' Medici Cardinale che fu poi Papa Leone, conosco, che andando voi a Roma, che è sentina di tutti mali, entrate in maggior difficoltà di far quanto vi dico di sopra.

Carte 30.[123] Jacomo Bonfadio a Monsignor Carnisecca. Doveva Idio, come i Romani conservano quella statua che cadde lor dal cielo, così conservar la vita di vostra Signoria per beneficio di molti: et lo farà.

Carte 57.[124] Il Guidiccione. Tanto desidero io ciò, quanto voi di venir in Roma, dove venuto, spero (colpa del corrotto vivere di questi preti) che conoscerete.

Carte 78. Lodovico Dolce. Et oltre a ciò, i beni della fortuna sono fragili, caduchi, e soggetti al voler di lei, che essendo cieca, e mutabile, così gli concede a quelli che non le meritano, come a coloro che ne son degni, senza niuna distincion fare.

Carte 79. Al vescovo di Castro. Si deveno levare alcune parole.

Carte 108. Sperone Speroni. E poi che per via di Monsignor Giustiniano, mi fu ditto, e per altri assai, ch'eravate sospeso, et ancora interdetto, alhora scrisse, e scrisse con quella fede che già feci salvi, Pietro e Maria.

123 The correct folio number "29" is added in the margin.

124 The correct folio number "56" is added in the margin.

Carte 109. Francesco Berna. E tutti co'l aiuto di Dio c'indrizziamo alla volta di Roma, onde se ci arrivo mai, e mi riposi un poco, potrebb'essere che vi facesse il bordello, voi per la via di Fiorenza per far l'amore con mia madre 15 o 20 dì, et andar un poco in choro con la Zanfarda, e poi trovar via al nome di Dio. E voi m. lo Piovano potreste ben, e doveresti, e ne sarebbe hormai tempo che ve ne venesti là, che non so ve vogliate far a Padua. Ma basta poi ch'io ho nominato il Piovano, dico a quel di S. Thomaso, che non speri da me indulgenza per tutta questa Quaresima, perché il Papa la consumerà tutta in viaggi, et io non sarò con Sua Santità se la vuol poi gridi, che sarà servito.

Added below by another hand:
Nel terzo libro a carte 57. Si lievi la lettera a m. Bartholomeo Sala.

1.12 Lodovico Castelvetro's Commentary on Aristotle

Castelvetro's complete works were put on the Roman *Indexes* of 1590, 1593 and 1596, always with the remark that they were prohibited until corrected.[125] His translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* with commentary was included in this ban as well as his commentary on Petrarch and his *Ragioni d'alcune cose segnate nella canzone d'Annibal Carlo: Venite a l'ombra de gran gigli d'oro*. There are a few notes on Castelvetro's case and I have identified three documents on his translation of Aristotles *Poetics* with his commentary, but it is difficult to bring them together.

The *Poetics* (ed. Vienna: Gaspare Stainhofer, 1570) was assessed by Vincenzo Guarini da Centula, *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index (1.12a). His assessment entitled *Castigationes* is undated but, according to the *Diari* of the Congregation's secretary, Guarini first presented them to the Congregation on 18 May 1590 and a second time, together with Don Seraphinus, shortly afterwards on 27 May. The *Diari* also reveal that the expurgation of Castelvetro's works was permitted only in 1597. Evidently, the Congregation commissioned the inquisitor of Modena to censor them because three years later, in February 1600, a letter was sent to his successor in which he was instructed to continue the censorship begun by his predecessor. In addition, the Congregation had received a censorship from a vicar of Florence who was asked to send another one that conformed to the norm of the *Index* ("ut ad normam Indicis censuras confectas mittat, et prosequatur commissas censuras librorum italici

125 Cf. *ILI*, ix, 829, 889 and 959.

idiomatis").[126] Apparently the Congregation received a positive reply from Modena. Another letter to the bishop of Modena, Gaspare Silingardi, dating from April 1597, shows that the bishop of Modena was willing to censor Castelvetro's works together with the inquisitor, and the letter recommends doing so according to the rules of the Index. The letter describes the books as "molto pestiferi" and informs the Roman Inquisition of them, suggesting that they could be used as a means of determining the quality of people in possession of such books. Two years later the Congregation was still waiting for the censorship and reminded the inquisitor of Modena to send them:

> Modena Inquisitore.
> Reverendo Padre Aspettano questi miei Illustrissimi Signori della Congregatione dell'Indice la Censura di tutte le opere del Castelvetro promessa già dal suo predecessore e da ridursi a perfettione con diligenza vostra insieme con Monsignor Vescovo conforme alle Regole dell'Indice, con dar aviso de libri pernitiosi che andrà scoprendo e delle difficultà che nasceranno e mandarà nota alfabetica de libri prohibiti o sospesi che havarà nell'Offitio.

Di Roma a dì primo di Marzo amorevole Il Cardinale di Verona.[127]

There is another censorship of Castelvetro's work, but it deals with the Basel edition of 1576 (1.12b). This document was put together by Marcantonio Marcello at the Inquisition of Venice. Although it carries no date, it was not written before 1594 because it refers to an edition of the *Decamerone* of the same year.[128] It is unlikely that this document reached the Congregation for the Index after 1614 because if it had it would have been part of the second *Protocolli* series (A^2 etc.) that begins in 1614 and is the work of the secretary Francesco M. Capiferro. Even though the documents of the *Protocolli* volume, which are filed together with this censorship, offer no reliable indication of the date of the censorship, it is interesting that they date from the years 1590 to 1600, as Marcello's *Correctio* might date from the same period. Another piece of evidence is a remark by Marcello. As shown above, he mentioned poetry dealing properly

126 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 40r–v, Ind. Diar. I, 101r, 19 April 1597, 131r.

127 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. V (1582–1602), 59r–v and 122r, letter from Cardinal Valier dated 1 March 1600 (copy).

128 Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 328r–9v.

with religious material, seemingly referring to a development of Roman censorship politics of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[129]

A letter by the inquisitor of Genoa which the Congregation for the Index received on 13 September 1599 may take us further. The inquisitor reports books he deems dangerous, such as satires and Andrea Calmo's letters, Doni's *Zucca*, *I Mondi* and *I Marmi* as well as Castelvetro's commented translation of Aristotle's *Poetics*, his commentary on Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and his text "contra Annibale Caro."[130]

How do all these documents fit together? At this stage it is not possible to give a definite answer, but as the censorships expected from Modena have not yet been found among the Roman files, it appears the censorial authorities of Modena did not follow the Roman request. If such was the case, it is possible that the Congregation for the Index, having received the criticism from the inquisitor of Genoa, made the request of the Inquisition of Venice, with which it was closely connected through Cardinal Valier, bishop of Verona. The request was eventually successful because the Congregation received the correction of the commentary in c. 1603.

At the National Library of St Mark's in Venice, I found another anonymous document on the censorship of the *Poetics* (doc. 1.12c), which likewise dates from the sixteenth century. It collates passages that had been removed from the Basel edition of the *Poetics*. As Marcello's *Correctio* was prepared in Venice, it is likely that this document refers to the second expurgation procedure undertaken in Venice.

1.12a *Poetics* Corrected I

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 349r–52v

Vincenti Guarini Abbatis Centula in Commentaria Lodovici Castelvetri Mutinensis super Poeticam Aristotelis Italica lingua conscripta Castigationes.

Sequimur Codicem Viennae impressum Anno Domini 1570 a Gaspare Stainofer Typographo.

Assignata mihi fuerunt Commentaria Lodovici Castelvetrii Italica lingua conscripta super Aristotelis Poeticen, ut, si quae opus haberent expurgatione,

129 See above, 84.

130 See *Nota de libri pernitiosi* of the inquisitor of Genoa, received by the Congregation for the Index on 13 September [1599], in Vatican, ACDF, Ind., XVIII, 75r–6v.

diligenter animadverterem. Lodovicus igitur Castelvetrius Mutinae, quae est insignis Galliae Cisalpinae Civitas in Flaminia, non ignobilibus ortus parentibus, nostra hac tempestate floruit: atque Graeci, Latini et Italici non ignarus eloquii, primam philosophiae et medicinae operam dedit; ac inter doctos et eruditos non postremum locum tenens, postmodum super Oda, seu Cantiuncula quadam ab Annibale Caro Hetrusca lingua composita vehementius, quam Annibali videbatur, insurgens, nobilem adversus eundem Carum construxit Apologiam. Et post multa ad Maximilianum secundum Romanum Caesarem se contulit, ut imminentes persecutionum procellas effugeret. Ubi benigne exceptus multa composuit. Ingenio polluit acuto, acri et plusquam Dialecticorum mere vehementi et contentioso. Stilo dicendi utitur duriore et, ut ita dixerim, spinoso ob frequentes divisiones atque subdivisiones nominumque innovationes innumerosque syllogismos, et argumenta, ne dicam sophismata, quibus id, quod adstruit, confirmare nimis proterve contendit. Et propter mentis acumen ad minima quaedam et futilia descendit, et aranearum mere tenuissimam telam, quae facili negotio conoscendi potest, contexit. Eius tamen opera et expositiones sunt admodum utiles et fructuosa: studiosorum enim ingenium acuunt, diligentesque reddunt lectores, ut veterum expositionibus non contenti nullique deferentes, sed proprio marte ad utramque partem, ut Accademici solent, arguentes, nova conquirant: atque iuxta scientiarum et artium praecepta ad summa quaedam, medioque carentia principia, quibus nemo sanae mentis repugnare possit, deveniant; et tandem veritatem ipsam, qua nihil est delectabilius, agnoscant. Scripsit, praeter Apologiam, in Francisci Petrarchae Odas, et Poemata non contenendas Commentationes, et alia nonnulla; et demum ex Greco Idiomate in Italicum Aristotelis Poeticam transtulit; tamque subtilissimis enarrationibus in dubium vertit. Nulla si fere est philosophi particula in hoc opusculo, nullumque Poeticae artis ab Aristotele traditum praeceptum, quod non vel tanquam falsum, vel diminutum, vel inversum, vel alio quopiam pacto depravatum, acutis syllogismis, vel potius cavillosis quibusdam captionibus, conetur ostendere. Euripidem, Pindarum, Lucretium, Virgilium, Dantem Aldegherium, Franciscum Petrarcham, Lodovicum Ariostum, omnesque poetas, et minime omnium Homerum, Marcum Tullium, Joannem Boccacium, et, ut uno verbo dicam, Auctores omnes tum soluta, tum alligata oratione scribentes Graecos, Latinos, Italicos in multis accusat; et tanquam scientiarum, atque artis scribendi ignaros redarguit. Omnia carpit, omnia obiurgat, et veluti ex Cynica Diogenis Schola progrediens canina mordacitate in omnes invehitur; atque in nullius licet praecipui, et clarissimi Scriptoris auctoritate conquiescit; idque propter nimiam ingenii sui subtilitatem. Quibusdam tamen deletis et immutatis poterunt haec commentaria, iudicio meo, in publicam studiosorum utilitatem concedi. Multi si sunt, qui haec Acribologia si minu-

tissima et diligente rerum perscrutatione delectentur, quae tamen, Philosopho in Metaphysicis et Moralibus teste in omnibus expectanda non est. Plerique vero, qui philosophicum animum non habent, ista contemnunt. Satisfaciamus igitur viris perspicatibus, et iis, qui acri sunt ingenio praediti. Caeterum his praelibatis nunc ad rem ipsam veniamus. Quondam igitur Auctor saepe in iis, quae dicit, exempla petit ex eo opere Ioannis Boccacii, quod Decameronem appellant; antequam iussu Patrum a Sacra Tridentina Synodo ad id subeundum munus selectorum tale opus fuisset expurgatum; ideo ea exempla immutanda sunt; prout in novissime castigato libro eloquens, et pius vir Leonardus Salviatus immutavit. In qua quidam re non nihil laboravi; ut, Aromatariorum more, quid pro quo reponerem. Nam ut ipsi, quando uno carent medicamento, pro eo aliud simile subiiciunt; eodem etiam pacto ego unum pro alio exemplum substitui. In quo, cum exempla multa sint non partes operis, et studii consumpsi, ut apte atque conciane singola singulis accomodarem.

Igitur in secundae partis principalis particula quinta (distinguit Castelvetrius commentaria sua in partes, et particulas) loquens de dolis, qui parantur iis hominibus, qui adeo hebeti, et obtuso sunt ingenio, ut vel prima rerum principia ignorent, inter alia ex Ioanne Boccacio haec adducit exempla: Pagina 51. facie 2.ª.

Giornata 3. Novella 8.

[Ferondo, che crede essere in purgatorio, et essere morto essendo vivo, che crede essere risuscitato.] Pro quo sic reponendum [Ferondo, che crede esser nell'altro mondo, et poi risuscitato.] Ibidem.

Giornata 3. Novella x.ª

[Et tale è Mibech, che crede col rimettere il diavolo in inferno servire a Dio.] Abradatur omnino hoc exemplum.

Ibi.

Giornata 4. Novella 2.

[Et tale è Madonna Lisetta da Ca' Querini, che crede giacere col l'Angelo Gabriello, giacendo con un frate.] Quod est sic corrigendum [Et tale è Madonna Lisetta, che crede giacere con Cupidine, giacendo con un huomo.]

Et non multo post in eadem particula. Pagina 52. facie 2. in fine.

Giornata 2. Novella x.ª

[Haveva detto m. Riccardo da Chinzica etc.] eo usque [in peccato pestello] inclusive. expungantur.

Et post pauca. pagina 53. facie i.

Giornata 8.ᵛª Novella 9.

[Comincia Bufalmacco a giurare così. Io fo boto all'alto Dio. et poi soggiunge, da Pasignano, con questa giunta, et differenza tra Dio, et Dio; tirando il giuramento in favole.] deleatur hoc exemplum.

Nec longius inde.
Giornata 6. Novella 3.
[come mostrando il Vescovo di Firenze il Maliscalco da Re Ruberto etc.] corrigatur [come mostrando messer Antono d'<. . .> il Maliscalco del Re Ruberto etc.]
Et paulo post.
Giornata 8. Novella 4.
[et nel proposto di Fiesole, che è soprapreso etc.] corrigatur [et nel Notaio di Fiesole, ch'è soprapreso etc.]
Et paucis interiectis
Giornata 4. Novella 2.
[et in frate Alberto soprapreso etc.] corrigatur [et in Alberto soprapreso etc.]
Et nonnullis appositis Pagina 54. facie p.ª
Giornata 6. Novella 8 [=7].
[dicendosi, che sicome i fanciulli etc.] eo usque [dunque più antichi, et per conseguente piu gentili sono i Baronci degli altri huomini] turpe et impudens dictum, ideo sic corrigatur [dicendosi, che i Baronci furon fatti al tempo, che s'era cominciato d'apparare a dipingere: ma gli altri huomini furon fatti poscia, che si seppe dipingere. et però più antichi, et per conseguente più gentili sono i Baronci degli altri uomini.]
Nec longius inde. Pagina 54. facie 2.
[ecco v'è uno essempio etc.] eo usque inclusive [la donna rise] auferantur haec omnia.
Et parte 3 Particula x.ª longe ante finem. Pagina 137. facie 2.
Giornata 8. Novella 4.
[della persona della ciutazza al Proposto di Fiesole] corrigatur [della persona della ciuttazza al Notaio di Fiesole]
In eadem x.ª particula non longe a fine. Pagina 139. facie p.ª.
Giornata 2. Novella 3.
[come Alessandro appresso il Boccaccio ignorò perpetuamente che l'Abbate fusse femina etc.] corrigatur [come Alessandro appresso il Boccaccio ignorò perpetuamente che 'l cavaliere fusse femina etc.]
Et Pagina 140. facie p.ª
Giornata 7. Novella 3.
[et l'adulterio dela comare con frate Rinaldo etc.] corrigatur et l'adulterio della Comare con Maestro Rinaldo Medico etc.]
Ibi.
Giornata 8. Novella 2.
[et l'adulterio di Monna Belcolore col sere di Varlunga] corrigatur [et l'adulterio di Monna Belcolore col Maestro di Varlunga]
Et paulo post.

Giornata 2. Novella 3.
[come l'Abbate è riputato huomo da Alessandro] Corrigatur [come il cavaliere è riputato huomo da Alessandro]
Et post pauca.
Giornata 3. Novella 7.
[et per mutatione accidentale d'habito secolare in religioso etc] Corrigatur [et per mutatione accidentale d'habito secolare in peregrino etc.]
Eadem parte 3.ª particula 16. circa medium. Pagina 188. facie p.ª
Giornata 3. Novella 8.
[la onde alcuno si potrebbe meravigliare, come il Boccaccio constituisca assai temerariamente etc.] eo usque inclusive [che tu dinomini da San Benedetto] Totum hoc exemplum deleatur, et sic aptentur verba [la onde alcuno si potrebbe maravigliare, come il Boccaccio constituisca assai temerariamente Anfoso Re di Spagna profeta, il qual propone due forzieri serrati] et quae secuntur, aliis omnibus intermediis verbis deletis, et abrasis.
Et parte 3.ª particula 4.ª Pagina 345. facie 2.
[sì come ancora dissi, che'l predetto Boccaccio non doveva fare, che l'Abbate etc.] eo usque inclusive [et sarebbono seguite cose altre sconvenevoli] deleantur haec omnia.

Haec, et alia, si quae sunt, exempla immutationem, et castigationem expostulant.
Nunc exemplis omissis maiora prosequamur.
. . .
Eadem parte 3.ª particula 14. circa medium. Pagina 172 (licet male legitur 170) facie p.ª.

Inter fabulas has etiam adnumerat [et Abraham si rimase di sagrificare Isaac suo figliuolo, per l'aiuto divino, che glielo vietò] Nec multo post et dall'Angelo di Dio fu impedita a Nabucadnosor l'essecutione del fatto, volendo ardere tre giovani Ebrei, non essendo né l'una, né l'altra essecutione commessa da Dio] Auferantur haec exempla, tum quia inter fabulas nullo pacto recenseri debent, quia verissima sunt, tum ne sacra prophanis admisceamus. Et eo magis, quia sine his id, quod Auctor dicit, clare perspici potest.
. . .
In eadem particula longius ante finem. Pagina 273. facie 2.

Legentur verba [Ma per aventura si potrebbe dire, che la maniera delle parole composte etc.] eo usque [che non han gli altri Poeti] huc usque bene. Sequitur [di che forse s'avvide colui, che scrisse quei libri] eo usque inclusive [degli Apostoli, et de' suoi discepoli] Quae verba temeraria sunt, et falsa. Nam ii libri in 3.ª Universali Constantinopolitana Synodo, et Catholicae Ecclesiae consensu tanquam Dionysii semper sunt recepti; atque in maximo honore habiti.

Imo in Breviario Romano in lectionibus, quas septimo Idus Octobris legimus, haec habentur verba [libros scripsit Dionysius admirabiles, ac plane celestes, de divinis nominibus, de celesti, et ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, et alios quosdam] Mirum igitur est, cur temerarius auctor haec prophano ore adversus sanctissimum et doctissimum virum ausus fuerit evomere. Quare haec dubia procul expungantur.

. . .

His itaque deletis, et immutatis, poterit, ut ab initio dixi, si ita Illustrissimis atque Doctissimis Patribus Dominis meis videbitur, hoc opus studiosis concedi, quo acutiores, atque exactiores in rerum indagatione reddantur.

1.12b *Poetics* Corrected II

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. N, 328r–9v.

Marcantonio Marcello, *Correttioni fatte nel Commento di Lodovico Castelvetro sopra la Poetica d'Aristotele*[131]

Ab Inquisitore Veneto transmisse (ca. 1603)

Correttioni fatte nel commento di Lodovico Castelvetro sopra la Poetica d'Aristotele stampato in Basilea nel 1576. da me, Marcantonio Marcello, intorno le cose, che potessero offendere la Religione, o i buoni costumi, Nelle quali ho lasciato stare molte considerationi, et essempi di cose della Religione; essendo che anche le cose della Religione debitamente descritte, si permettono in Poesia, come si vede nella comedia di Dante, Nell'Angeleide del Valvasone, nel Poema de Partu Virginis del Sannazaro, nella Christiade del Vida, et in molti altri Poemi. Nel corregger le auttorità tolte dal Decamerone del Boccaccio ho seguito la correttione fatta dal Cavallier Salviati, come si trova stampato in Venetia nel 1594. levando, mutando, et lasciando a punto come in quello s'è fatto.

carta 13. linea 33.

Dio è ben sustantia vivente per anima ragionevole: et l'Angelo, et l'anima separata dal corpo sono sustantia vivente ragionevole, et sensibile, sicome specialmente dimostrano le pene de gli Angeli rubella, e delle anime dannati.

carta 52. linea 5.

131 See the censor's own explanation of his use of underlining and brackets at the end of the censorship.

La seconda sono (per così dire) gli Jddii celestiali, et coloro, che sono creduti godere la gloria eterna del cielo, secondo le credenze delle Religioni, come Dio verace, gli Angeli eletti, et l'anime beate, et (appresso Gentili) Giove, et Giunone, Apollo, Mercurio, e simili, insieme con gli Jddii terrestri, marini et infernali, come sono le Ninfe de fonti, de prati, di monti, di selve, e i fauni, e i satirici, et brevemente tutti i Demoni, et come sono Nettuno, Proteo, et simili: et Galatea con l'altre Ninfe del mare; et come sono Plutone, Proserpina, le furie, et così fatte Deità con l'anime tormentate, et con l'anime godenti, et tranquillanti ne campi elisi, o come sono i Diavoli, et l'anime de dannati, Percioché tutti i sopradetti sono creduti da gli huomeni grossi haver forma humana, et per conseguente (secondo la proprietà della natura loro) poter parlare; o perché si deano gli huomeni ad intendere, che in così fatta forma siano appariti alcuna volta.

carta 93. linea 39. Tale è Ferondo, che crede essere in purgatorio, et esser morto.[132]

linea 41. Et tale è Alibech, che crede col rimettere il Diavolo in Inferno servire a Dio. Et tale è madonna Lisetta da ca' Querini, che crede giacere con l'Angelo Gabriello giacendo con un frate.[133]

carta 95. linea 25. Haveva detto m. Ricciardo di Chinzica alla moglie. Vuoi tu stare in peccato mortale? il qual detto era lodevole, e santo: et ella tirando il moto per figura chiamata παρονομασία in parte diversa, disse, se io hora sto in peccato mortaio, io starò quando che sia in peccato pestello.

carta 96. linea 10. Il Vescovo di Firenze. Corregasi, e leggasi messere Antonio.

linea 22. Nel Proposto da Fiesole. Correggasi, et leggasi, Nel Notaio del Vescovo di Fiesole.

linea 40. In frate Alberto.

Carta 97. linea 31. Così Domenedio, quando fece i Baronzi non sapeva ancora dipingere, havendo loro fatti visi così sformati: ma poi che sapeva dipingere, haveva fatti i visi bei proportionati a gl'altri.

carta 98. linea 21. Ecco v'è uno nelle novelle antiche. Avenne che un giorno un, che haveva gran naturale, si trovò con una putta: quando furo in camera, et elli lo mostrò, et per grande allegrezza la donna rise.

carta 197. linea 26. Le persone divote impongono i nomi de Santi huomeni morti a figliuoli, credendo di constituirgli loro avocati, et procuratori dinanzi a Dio.[134]

carta 249. linea 27. Alessandro appresso il Boccaccio ignorò perpetuamente, che l'Abbate fosse femina.

---

132 Added above "in purgatorio": "nell'altro mondo."

133 Added above "l'Angelo Gabriello": "Cupido," above "con un frate": "un medico."

134 Added above "credendo": "sperando."

carta 251. linea 2: Et l'adulterio della comare con frate Rinaldo sotto l'apparenza d'uno incantesmo.[135]

linea 5. L'Adulterio di Monna Belcolore col sere di Varlungo.[136]

linea 29. L'Abbate è riputato huomo da Alessandro, essendo femina.[137]

carta 337. linea 14. Perché è da sapere, che la commune gente crede,[138] che Dio al presente regga altramente il mondo,[139] che non reggeva[140] anticamente i Gentili, percioché è opinione che ne secoli presenti lo regga tacitamente senza dimostrarsi in persona con ispirationi,[141] con segni, o con visioni, con ammonitioni di suoi servi, et con altri mezi non intesi, ne considerati dalla gente grossa, sì come dall'altra parte è opinione,[142] che ne primi antichi secoli al tempo de semidei Dio havesse cura del mondo apparendo personalmente,[143] et ragionando con gli huomeni, li quali secondo il paganesimo erano suoi figliuoli.

carta 338. linea 37.

Il Boccaccio contribuisca assai temerariamente l'Abbate Profeta,[144] che havendo messo Ferondo in Purgatorio, gli fa dire, confortati, che a Dio piace,[145] che tu torni al mondo; dove tornato, tu havrai un figliuolo della tua Donna, il quale farai, che tu nomini Benedetto, percioché per li prieghi del suo santo Abbate et della tua donna, et per amor di s. Benedetto ti fa questa gratia, conciosiacosa che se fosse nata una femina, come era possibile, la Profetia dello Abbate sarebbe stata vana,[146] et bugiarda, in diminuimento della buona opinione della santità dello Abbate, che haveva Ferondo di lui, et desiderava l'Abbate,[147] che havesse. Perché più saviamente havrebbe fatto, se havesse usate nella Profetia parole dubbie, le quali si fossero potute acconciare al maschio, et alla femina, come tu havrai una criatura della tua donna, la quale farai, che tu dinomini di s. Benedetto.

carta 472. linea 35. Prete di Varlungo (correggi Maestro di Varlungo)

---

135 Added above "frate": "medico."

136 Added above "sere": "maestro."

137 Added above "l'Abbate": "il cavalliere."

138 Added above "commune gente crede": "Religione insegna."

139 Added above "regga": "regge."

140 Added above "reggeva": "stimava reggere."

141 Added above "opinione": "tiene che."

142 Added above "è": "fu."

143 Added above "Dio havesse": "havessero i Dei."

144 Added above "Abbate": "medico."

145 Added above "che a Dio piace": "tu tornerai."

146 Added above "dello Abbate": "del medico."

147 Added above "Abbate": "il medico."

carta 555. linea 27. Mercurio, et Iri, li quali messi (nelle fintioni de Poeti) non apportano mai la falsità.
carta 557. linea 20. Nella novella di don Felice, et di frate Puccio.
linea 23. Frate Puccio.
carta 564. linea 4. Tanto tempo quanto l'anima di colui, ch'era richiamata al corpo morto di Erictho ne stesse fuori (forse) acció che la Giustitia Divina non fosse frodata.
carta 566. linea 2. Ma bene è credibile (forse) accioché la giustitia Divina non restasse di riscuoter la debita pena.
carta 583. linea 37. Che si sa per historia, o per fama esser fatta da Dio principalmente, et manifestamente (qualunque si sia quel Dio) come si sa per fama, che Bacco tramutò i nochieri.
carta 584. linea 2. Come (appresso i Gentili) altri considerando.
linea 15. L'Imperio Romano era stato cagione prossima della magnifica Signoria (temporale) del Papa.
carta 622. linea 7. L'attioni miracolose di Dio appo i Pagani, che di sopra chiamammo principali.[148]
carta 627. linea 21. Il Boccaccio non doveva fare che ~~il medico~~ l'Abbate facesse predire a Ferondo,[149] che della sua donna havrebbe un figliuolo maschio, il quale dovesse nominar Benedetto ad honore di s. Benedetto percioché per li orationi dell'Abbate, et della donna, et per amor di san Benedetto Dio gli faceva questa gratia.
carta 635. linea 13. Senza che essendo questa mortalità mandata da Dio per far che i Greci.[150]
linea 30. Questa pestilenza mandata da Dio, et balestrata dalle nuvole da Apollo.
carta 656. linea 19. Et si legge nel libro de i Giudici al capitolo 9. che la vite dice, poss'io lasciare il vino mio, che rallegra Dio et gli huomeni?
linea 22. Et se la scrittura dice, che il vino rallegra Dio.

Ove è la Parentesi, sono parole aggionti nella correttione. ove sono tirate linee, tutte quelle parole sono depennate, et levate via.

148 Added above "di Dio": "de Dei."
149 Added above "l'Abbate": "il medico."
150 Added above "Dio": "Apolline."

1.12c *Poetics* Corrected III

Venice, BNM, Marc. It. XI, 180 (6523), 147r–v.

[Anon.], Quante, et quali sieno le cose levate nella seconda stampa dalla Poetica di m. Lodovico modenese, a compiacimento d'alcuni troppo scropulosi di questo misero secolo.

Mancano nella terza parte principale, et nella settima particella, che'è a carte 200. su la viggesima nona riga, le seguenti parole

1. Et come fece Papa Clemente settimo, non come papa papa, ma come privato a Giovanni Angelo, che fu poi papa Pio quarto sopranomandolo de Medici. La qual donatione etc. Et a riga 37.
2. Sì come faceva il predetto papa Pio quarto. Et a carte 201. riga 32.
3. Et di questa vanità sciocca sono colpevoli i papi, i quali si mutano i nomi, come prima sono criati papi, havendo impresa questa usanza per successione da suoi predecessori, la quale hebbe origine da papa Sergio, che domandandosi prima col nome di Bocca di porco, et parendogli cosa indegna ad uno, che sedesse nella sedia papale arbitro libero di tutto il mondo christiano, lo cambiò in Sergio. Altravolta etc. Et pure nella predetta particella a carte 202, righe 8.
4. Sì come Martino Bucero, sapendo che nella chiesa di Roma i suoi libri non erano ricevuti, et giudicando, che i Salmi di David, traslati et sposti da lui, sarebbono di grandissimo profitto spirituale ad ognuno pur che fossero letti, rimosse il suo nome, e'l sopranome, et in suo luogo ripose Aretio Fellino. Perché i predetti salmi sicuramente si sparsero per tutto et commendati fuori di modo da tutto anchora in Roma medesima, nonché altrove, infino a tanto pervenne a notitia degli inquisitori, ch'egli n'era stato l'autore, gli quali gli bandirono, abomininarono, arsero, et vetarono come cosa pestilentiosa. Benché etc.
   Pure ivi a righe 19.
5. Pietro. Laonde pare che Martino Bucero, il quale in sua lingua era consumato, conservasse i suoi nomi, quantunque trasportandogli in lingua latina trasmutasse Martino in Aretio, voce greca di significato pari, et Bucero, voce tedesca in Fellino, voce latina, di significato pari. Hora etc.
   Et a carte 289. riga 40.
6. Comedia, et se alcuno ne dubitasse, ritrovasi alla rappresentatione della passione di nostro signore, dove ciò s'usa et spetialmente Roma, et contenga le risa, se può. Et a carte 550, riga 22.

7. Piangere sicome dicemmo di sopra, che aveniva nella rappresentatione della passione del signore in quelle contrade, che si costuma di fare con poca edificatione del popolo. Oltre etc.
   Et a carta 584. riga 16. et 20.
8. Papa. S'imagina, che Dio, cui egli reputava godere, et compiacersi nella grandezza et nella esaltatione del papa, havere permesso, quasi piegandosi al quanto dalla sua severa giustitia, per maggior sua honoranza procedente dal papato essaltato.
   Et più giù alla 20 riga.
9. Papa. Non si potendo fare a credere, che il commune di spontanea volontà si fosse mai indotto a sprezzare tanto la libertà, che si fosse fatto servo d'un prete. Perché etc. Et a carta 608. riga 21.
10. Luoghi. Di che a tempi nostri s'è acerbamente tenzonato per cagione della disputa della presenza del corpo del nostro signore nella cena et simili. Et a carta 629. riga 26.
11. Lettere, come non era dovero al Boccaccio, che raccontando le cose degne di misericordia di nuovo avenute nel tempo della pestolenziosa mortalità facesse, che persone trapassassero dalla presente vita, senza havere chi udisse le loro confessioni, o chi gli comunicasse, o desse loro l'estrema untione, et non dimeno ad alcuna parte de lettori de tempi presenti parrebbe dovero, che si fossero taciute simili cose, non le reputando atte a muovere compassione, per l'opinione sopravenuta, che non sieno cose necessarie in simili casi. Appresso etc.
12. Tante, et tali son le cose levate dalla poetica stampata la seconda volta in Basilea.

1.13 Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare*

Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare: sopra il Boccaccio* is listed in Di Dio's *Index* (1576) in the section *Libri sospetti* with the remark that it should be corrected ("corrigantur"), in the *Annotatio librorum prohibitorum* of the Inquisition of Alessandria in 1580 and, again with a reference to a correction ("corrigatur frater") in the *Index* of Parma in 1580.[151]

The *Ricchezze* is more than just a dictionary of words and phrases used in the *Decamerone*. It also includes words and phrases of Boccaccio's *Philocolo, Fiammetta, Ameto, Laberinto d'amore* and *Epistola confortatoria a Messer Pino*

151 See Vatican, ACDF, XIV, Index and *ILI*, ix, 751–2.

de Rossi. What is more, it offers an *Espositione de vocabuli difficili, usati da Dante, dal Petrarca, & da altri Autori, ma non tutti gli usati dal Boccaccio, impero che quelli sono nell'Opera per ordine di Alphabeto* and *Voci usate da più antichi thoscani, che hoggi poco o niente si usano*. It may have been considered a book of public utility. It is therefore no surprise that a first correction was worked out for the Congregation for the Index as early as 1582 (1.13a).

Its author is Gregorio of Naples and it is based on the edition published by Giovan Maria Bonelli in Venice in 1555.[152] The outcome of this expurgation measure is not clear, for Alfonso Chacón included a brief note in his *M.F. Alfonsi Ciaconis sententia de expurgandis denuo aliquot libris catholicorum, qui cum multa utilitate expurgati legi possunt: vel quorum authores suspecti sunt*, stating that the work was worthy of expurgation.[153] This note was written after 1583, and in the late 1580s, the *Ricchezze* were again examined at the Inquisition of Perugia (1.70). In addition, I have found a third, quite elaborate censorship, which is anonymous and undated. However, the Congregation's *Diari* contain evidence that the third document was prepared in Ferrara and expected to serve for a new expurgated print version (1.13b)

As shown above, in February 1600 the Congregation for the Index charged the Inquisition of Ferrara not only with the expurgation of *Orlando furioso* but also Alunno's *Ricchezze*. Letters of March and October 1600 show that the Congregation in fact expected a good result from Ferrara. It hoped the correction could be carried out without ruining the work.[154]

What is more, a comparison between this third document and the *Correttione* of the *Furioso* shows strong analogies in form. In both cases the criticized passages are presented very diligently in a tabular list and written by a very skilled hand. There are hardly any comments, just precise bibliographical notes with quotations of the incipit of the criticized passages.

1.13a *Le Ricchezze* Expurgated

Vatican, BAV, Vat. Lat. 12728, 36r–v.

Ricchezze della lingua vulgare di Francisco Alunno sopra il Boccaccio stampato in Venetia nel 1555. Dimostra di trattare de vocaboli, et poi va trattando in disonore de Ecclesiastici . . .

---

152 See Vatican, BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 12728, 69ss.

153 Cf. Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 249r.

154 Vatican, ACDF, *Ind. Diar.* I, 130v, Ind. V (1582–1602), 121r and 130v.

A

Alla terza colonna al principio quasi, cassa, colui che s'abbatte a Donna non conveniente a se.

Cassa al corpo di Iddio che io dico da dovero, al digiuno della quadragesima. Albergo cassa, va, et sappi, s'il tuo San Giuliano questa notte ti darà buono albergo.

Alla, cassa, ruzzandosi Messer lo Monaco troppo con la donna alla scapestra. allegrare cassa, io giuro a Dio.

Ampolla cassa del sodore di S. Michele

Ampolla. Vaso di vetro da vino etc. Una Ampolla del sudore di san Michele. 1460.

Andare circa il fine cassa, se tu andarai alle femine da torno i frati non haverando lo loco.

Se tu andrai alle femine datorno; i frati non havranno lo luogo.

Va cassa, va è sappi s'il tuo S. Giuliano ti darà buono albergo. Per Dio bono vatti con Dio.

Appetito, al fine cassa frate Rinaldo ne i primi A. cominciò a visitare spesso la comare.

Attaccare, cassa alla Cristianella di Dio.

Avedere circa la metá, cassa, che di cosa che l'Abbadessa in capo avesse non si avedevano.

Avezzo cassa del Monaco che essendo dal marito.

B

Banditore cassa di sacre, et di feste si ben sapevate gli digiuni, et le vigilie.

Beneficio, cassa, et per B. ecclesiastici, et le divine cose a B. appertinenti a denari vendevano, et compravano.

C

Capitare cassa, quante volte Don Giovanni in tre Santi capitato tante se li menava a casa.

Ciuffetto, cassa, egli mi mostrò il ciuffetto del Serafino che apparse a san Francesco.

Ciurmare, cassa che danno quelli dalla gratia di San Paolo.

D

Disonestà, cassa, l'Abbate da disonesto amore perso.

E

Elettione, cassa il Papa si maravigliò assai dell'habito della Donna, et della sua elettione.
Et cassa la malvagità et ipochrisia d'i Religiosi

F

Fimbrie, cassa questi frati con le fimbrie ampissime avolgendosi molte pinzochere, molte vedove d'avilopparsi, etc.
insino, del cui vestimento. exclus.

G

Gravezza, cassa l'Abatte temendo di non offendere la giovene, etc. insino a La presente opera exclus.

H

Hipochrisia, cassa dimostrare quanta, et quale sia l'Hipochrisia etc. insino Hispagna. exclus.

I

Infestare cassa la bona donna vegendosi molto sellecitata, etc. insino Infestamento. exclus.

N

Ne in vece del genetivo, cassa un vino sì bono che ne beverebbbe Christo.

P

Passato circa 16 linee. Cassa Messer lo Prete quando la domenica mattina etc. insino, dove quando non la exclus.
Per, con i nomi, cassa, per lo corpo di Christo insino Alcuna volta. exclus.
Pinzochero, cassa, i frati con le fimbrie ampissime, etc. insino Pio. exclus.
Ponere, 15 lin. inanzi al fine cassa Messer l'Abbate postole l'occhio adosso, et vedendola bella
Predicha cassa fra Cepolla.
Prete, cassa, era quella notte l'Abbatessa, etc. insino, che andando due preti, exclus.

R

Racchiudere, cassa fra Cepolla.
Religgione, cassa la malvagia hypochrisia de Religiosi.

Ricoverare, cassa frate Alberto dalla finestra gittatosi, etc. insino di chi alcuna. Exclus.
Rimproverare, cassa, un Monacho caduto in peccato, etc. insino, et discorredo. Exclus.
Roma, cassa, la quale com'è hoggi coda, cossì già fu.

S

Sacramento, cassa, Non si vorrà confessare ne prendere alcun sacramento etc. insino, Saetta, exclus.
Salda cassa, mi mostrò il dito del spirito santo, così intero, et saldo come mai fu.
Saltero, cassa, l'Abbadessa come meglio seppe si vestì, etc. insinuo, Salto. exclus.
San. Cassa, una Ampolla del sudor di san Michele quando combatte col Diavolo.
Serafino, cassa, et il ciuffetto del Seraphino che apparve a san Francesco, et una delle unghie de Cherubini.
Sonno, cassa, la santa, et cassa dal Cielo: et circa il fine dice santa Dea. Cassa, santa.

T

Trafiggere, cassa, Hipocrita carità de frati di quello, etc. insino Trafitte, exclus.
Tributo, cassa, ma i frati minori a suon di nacchere le rendon.

U

Vinegia, cassa, io voglio che voi veggiate l'Agnolo, etc. insino le donne vinitiane. inclus.
Vitio, cassa, la vitiosa, et lorda vita de cherici.
Unghia, cassa, una delle Unghie de cherubini.

1.13b *Le Ricchezze* Censored

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 348r–v

[Inquisition of Ferrara], Censura sopra le Ricchezze della lingua volgare, ca. 1600]

Vide libro primo folio 6. prima et seconda colonnae in fine
folio 11, seconda colonna infine.
folio 22, prima colonna versiculo: Onde, e folio 23, prima colonna versiculo: L'Aretino.
fol. 27. 2ª col. in principio.

fol. 33. 2ª col. vers.: Hora.
fol. 36. pª col. vers.: Onde.
fol. 42. pª col. vers.: et nel 3.
fol. 46. pª col. vers.: Nel significato in principio.
fol. 49. pª col. vers.: et quinci. in fine.
fol. 50. pª col vers.: A lato. in medio.
fol. 52. 2ª col. vers.: et amano, et vers.: Differente.
fol. 63. pª col vers.: cioè.
fol. 70. 2ª col vers.: il Boccaccio.
fol. 72. pª col. vers.: Alla qual. Ibi: Non vi.
fol. 78. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 83. pª col. vers.: Sì come.
fol. 88. 2ª col. in fine.
fol. 90. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 91. pª col. vers.: Hora.
fol. 97. 2ª col. in fine.
fol. 98. 2ª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio vers.: Onde.
fol. 100. pª col. in fine.
fol. 125. 2ª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.
fol. 128. 2ª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.
fol. 137. 2ª col. vers.: sì come.
fol. 139. pª col. in principio.
fol. 148. 2ª col. vers.: et come.
fol. 152. pª col. vers.: Dalla proposta. infine.
fol. ibi pª col. vers.: et il.
fol. 168. 2ª col. vers: in principio.
fol. 178. pª col. vers.: sì come.
fol. 187. pª col. vers.: Benché.
fol. 192. 2ª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.
fol. 194. 2ª col. vers.: fu nondimeno infine.
fol. 195. 2ª col. vers.: et in cotale.
fol. 198. pª col. vers.: in fine.

Vide libro 4º folio 226. pª colonna ma nel primo et nella 70.[155]
fol. 230. 2ª col. vers.: et in altre.
fol. 236. pª col. vers. in fine vers. primi.
fol. 282. 2ª col. vers.: Nella sopra.
fol. 285. 2ª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.

155 The word *verso* has been added above *nel*.

fol. 286. 2ª col. vers.: la prima.
fol. 287. 2ª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.
fol. 296. pª col. vers.: Buono.
fol. 308. 2ª col. vers.: Iacquesi.
fol. 324. pª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.

Libro sesto folio 337. prima colonna verso: et sul monte.
fol. 341. 2ª col. vers.: Al quale.
fol. 347. 2ª col. vers.: Lascio.
fol. 349. 2ª col. 2ª col. vers.: Ecci. in fine.
fol. 354. 1ª col. vers.: Sono dal.
fol. 354. 2ª col vers.: Dal nome.
fol. 356. pª col. in principio
fol. 366. pª col. vers.: e ben vero.
fol. 389. 2ª col. vers.: ma in luogo.
fol. 392. pª col. vers.: Dal nome.
fol. 398. pª col. in principio.

Libro 7º fol. 406. 2ª col. vers.: et non molto.
fol. 407. pª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio.
fol. 411. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 427. 2ª col. vers.: et diversamente.
fol. 436. pª col. vers.: Alla quale.
fol. 462. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 464. 2ª col. vers.: et il Bocc. ancora.
fol. 468. 2ª col.: Che si disse.
fol. 470. pª col. vers.: Onde quel.
fol. 475. 2ª col. vers.: et nel primo.
fol. 477. pª col. vers.: et il Boccaccio nella. N. 24.

Libro 8º fol 499. 2ª col. vers.: et ancora.
fol. 528. pª col. vers.: Et il Boccaccio nel. i.
fol. 548. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 557. 2ª col. in principio ad finem usque [sic].

Libro 9º fol. 570. pª col. vers.: Benché così.
fol. 577. 2ª col.: e per contrario.
fol. 605. 2ª col. vers.: et nella prima.
fol. 626. 2ª col. vers.: et Dano nel. i.

Libro 9º fol. 627. pª col. vers.: Che in altra.
fol. 630. 2ª col. vers.: et ne i quali.
fol. 656. pª col. vers.: ma per trapassare.
fol. 663. 2ª col. vers.: et sì come.
fol. 673. 2ª col. vers.: sì leggono.
fol. 678. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 682. 2ª col. vers.: Nella quale.
fol. 684. pª col. vers.: Alla sub principio.

Libro 10 fol. 723. pª col. vers.: et non meno.
fol. 728. 2ª col. in principio.
fol. 745. pª col. vers.: il Boccaccio ancora.
fol. 773. 2ª col. vers.: et nel convit.

Libro 11 fol. 833. 2ª col. vers.: il Bocaccio.
fol. 859. 2ª col. vers.: et in altro.
Nihil in libro XII.

1.14 Dialogues on Love and Beauty by Niccolò Vito de Gozze

According to the files of the Congregation for the Index, as far back as the 1580s the dialogue on beauty by Niccolò Vito de Gozze was deemed useless and considered to contravene good morals ("est liber prorsus inutilis et visum esse contra bonos mores").[156] I found a censorship of this dialogue that includes another one on Gozze's dialogue on love. The censor was Antonio Ciccarelli, who also worked out a censorship of *Il Cortegiano* for the expurgated edition that appeared in 1584. The document is not dated, but Ciccarelli submitted it to Sisto Fabri di Lucca, whom he addressed as master of the sacred palace. Sisto Fabri held this office from 1580 to 1583, so the censorship must date from this period. This coincides with the note in the *Diari*.

1.14a Gozze's Introduction

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. C, 339r–44r

Censura

156 See Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B; Niccolò Vito de Gozze, *Dialogo d'amore detto Antos, secondo la mente di Platone* (Venice: Francesco Ziletti, 1581) and *Dialogo della bellezza detto Antos, secondo la mente di Platone* (Venice: Francesco Ziletti, 1581).

Nel Dialogo delle bellezze detto Antos
Composto
Da m. Nicolo Vito Raguseo
Censura Antonij Ciccarelli Fulginatis
Super dialogos di Pulchritudine et amore Nicolaj Viti ad Reverendissimum Patrem Sixtum Sacri Palatijj Magistrum

Duos prae manibus habeo dialogos materna nostra lingua conscriptos quos Nicolaus Vitus Epidarius, et composuit et nunc primum in suum ac <…> edidit: <…> duo mulieres summa forma ac spetie (ut fingitur) praestantes pro dialogi personis apponuntur <…> ratiocinantes (iuxta Platonis sensum) de pulchritudine, et amore; suamque formam et mutuum ardorem blandis verbis passim extollentes:

De his ut quid sententiam brevibus dicam sic habeto. Mihi cogitanti in mentem subijt nimium multos extare sermones a viris praestantibus conscriptos, tum de pulchritudine, tum de amore: Quorum lectio quantum Christianis officiat omnibus compertum est qui sciunt bonos mores corrumpere collega mala: his si legendis mirum immodum animus in libidinem incitatur et eo magis luxuriae ardore fervet, si mulieres formosas de forma et amore disserentes audiat: Quamobrem iudicarem tum quia multi alij libri extant in quali de his copiose, et suculenter, et ingeniose tractatur: tum etiam quia mulieres de his loquentes adducuntur, tum etiam quia quaedam in his dialogis leguntur, quae christiano viro omni parte probari neqeunt.

Giudicarem isque librum hunc Romae admittendum non fore iam satis quod ipse sensum explicatum est, nunc ipsum loquentem audiamus: et quoniam ut inquit D. Th. multa quae in una lingua uno modo sonant in alia diverso modo sonare videntur decrevi eodemmet autoris eloquentiae errores recensere, ut fidelius a me narrarentur.

1.14b Dialogue on Beauty

Errore Primo
Nel dialogo della Bellezza

A carta p.ª facie 2. Maria Gondola: Anzi credo, che per fare cosa, che grata potesse essere alla bellezza vostra non mancherebbono d'introdurmi viva nelle lor stanze gl'Angeli beati non che le ~~Ni'f~~ Ninfe, le quali alcuni hanno tenute per ~~molta~~ mortali. Chi non conosce non esser convenevole in questa ~~mater~~ maniera ragionare degl'Agneli beati.

Errore 2
A carta 2. facie prima. Maria Gondola. Non mi maraviglio di questo filosofo p perché intendo, ch'ancho che egli negò gl'immortali iddij, da quali prende origine la bellezza, come bene afferma Santo Agostino nostro dottore Santo Agostino non dirà, che dagli immortali iddi nasca la bellezza ma si ben da Iddio.

Errore 3
A carte 4[v] et 5 facie prima. M. Hor chi non crederà, essendo voi tanto bella, et così vaga, che l'animo vostro non sia disceso da i chori Angelici. F. Se io sono discesa da i chori angelici (come voi dite) conosco ch'anchor voi siete stata meco in quelle stanze beate dalle quali insieme insieme partissimo per venire qua giù al mondo. M. Io di certezza non me ne ricordo: ma voi ch'avete l'animo sì purgato, di ciò facilmente potete ricordarvi: Hor' io prego la maestà d'Iddio, che ci conceda per sua gratia di potere insieme rivedere quelle stanze eterne della felicità nostra, dalle quali partimmo per venire in questo mondo. Che l'anime nostre habitassero in cielo et poscia discendessero in terra fu opinione di Platone seguita da Origene, ma dannata dalla Santa Chiesa alla quale parmi che questo autore tropo aderisca.

Errore 4
A carta 26 (=27). facie. 2. F. Vi dirò, molte donne sono al mondo a cui in sdegno viene, quando sono amate, et reverite, et honorate per la beltà loro; et queste tali sono di vile, cruda et fiera natura. Le quali così come hanno in odio d'essere amate che pure è cosi, credo che odijno anchora la beltà che Iddio et la benigna natura per ornamento loro diedero per la qual cosa dovete sapere mia bella et dolce gondolina. Che la maestà d'Iddio ha create tutte le cose in questo mondo di qualunque perfettione siano per nostra consolatione, però chiunque bello si sdegna quando viene ad essere amato riverito et onorato dalli spiriti gentili commette grave errore e peccato. Quest'è tropo licentioso per fare come ognuno può vedere.

Errore 5
A carta 31. facie p.ª
M. Et di voi mia bella et gentil fiore si può ben veramente dire che siate la più bella, la più pudica, la più onesta donna del mondo et che per la vostra bellezza singolare meritate essere nel choro degl'Angeli beati non che di vivere fra noi. Parmi che sì fatto ragionare se bene è da molti usato non dimeno sia pieno di tropo licenza.

1.14c Dialogue on Love

Errore 6
Nel dialogo del amore a carta 4 facie p.ª dice che la dottrina de i Platonici è quasi infallibile. Questa parmi tropo gran laude da darsi a filosofi gentili il che non si conviene, sì come ne dimostra Santo Agostino ne i libri de Retractatione.

Errore 7
A carta 8. dice (s'io non m'inganno) ~~nega~~ che lo spirito santo ~~sia~~ nella creatione del universo è concorso sub ratione causae finalis tantum, et non sub ratione causae efficientis, ilche non si conceda da i Theologi percioché anchorché verissimo sia ch'Iddio sia la causa finale del universo ratione veritatis: la qual' è attributo dello spirito santo nondimeno sub ratione causae efficientis conviene la creatione anche allo spirito santo perché dice Dionisio 2.º cap. de divinis nominibus: communia totius divinitatis sunt omnia creabilia.

Errore 8
A carta 4 facie 2 dice ch'essendo l'anima nostra entrato in questo corpo tenebroso è grave secondo il suo gran destino subito smarisce la strada.

Errore 9
A carta 16 facie prima, d'Amore parmi, che molte donne siano schive, e credendosi, ch'egli sia un brutto et nefando Iddio: ma le misere non sanno, ch'egli tra gl'iddij et gli uomini regna.

Errore 10
A carta 17 facie 2 S'è cosa debita alla republica Raugea porgere aiuto a i Cristiani contra il Turco: A me non piace mettere in dubio questo perché è cosa chiara, ch'ad ogni fedele apertiene porgere aiuto contra i Turchi.

Errore 11
A carta 22 facie prima F. Grande amore è questo che voi mi portate, mia dolce gondolina, Onde crederò, ch'Iddio ci ha mandato qui in terra (mercè la sua divina gratia) per mostrare di nuovo al mondo quanto effetto può l'amore fra due che in amore sono congiunti. M. Sia quel che si voglia io mi contento del nostro amore perché tengo che questo sarà possente di ridurci da questa trista è tenebrosa vita, alla migliore e più serena.

Errore 12
A carta 22. facie 2. M. Ma che strada ha da tenere un amante, che dalla sua amata possa essere amato? F. dirovvi, mia dolce Gondolina, per insegnare questa strada a gl'amanti a noi donne tanto non si conviene per alcuni tristi e maligni rispetti, che hoggidì, come ben meco sapete, al mondo sono.

Errore 13
A carta 24. facie 2. Però, prego la maestà d'iddio mi conceda, per sua bontà, questa spetial gratia anzi ch'io veggia la partenza vostra mi chiuda gl'occhi con sempiterno sonno, ch'altrimenti la mia vita teneria al pari di quelle che giù nel inferno delle anime condannate sono perché a rivedersi poi crederò, che non sarebbe possibile fin al giuditio ultimo del gran iddio.

Errore 13 (=14)
A carta 25, [facie 1] Ma preghiamo la ~~sua~~ maestà d'iddio, che per sua natural bontà ci conceda questa gratia: perché maggiore non desidero havere, che possiamo di questo mondo insieme al altro partire.

Errore 14 (=15)
A carta 29 facie 2 parla l'autore d'Amore tropo licentiosamente.

Errore 15 (=16)
A carta 34 facie 2. M. Poscia che mi havete dichiarato, mia bella e dolce ~~Gondelina~~ fiore, l'influentia di ciascuno pianeta celeste, credo anzi tengo di certo ch'havendo l'anima vostra fatto il passaggio dalli superni Chori per venire qua giù al mondo etc. Questa è opinione di Platone et d'Origine nella quale habbiamo ripreso l'autore perché mostra tropo ad essa aderire.

Errore 16
A carta 35. facie 2. Voi siate una Dea scesa dal cielo qua giù nel mondo per mostrare il bene, et il bello che la su gl'angeli et l'anime beate godono.

Errore 17
A carta 39 facie p.ª Chi sarà dunque di sì vile et fiera natura che l'amoroso stato stimi un peccato et un dishonore grave.

Si potrebbe questo Autore difendere dicendo ch'egli parla secondo l'opinione di Platone ma dall'altra parte chiaramente si vede ch'egli tropo si aderisce.

Documents 2: Relating Documents

2.1 Instructions for the Correction of Books

According to the Congregation's *Diari*, the *Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri* was thought to be a guideline for expurgation to be published under the name of Sixtus V. After detailed deliberation on its content and form, the *Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri* was accepted by the Congregation for the Index with a decree issued 14 May 1587.[1] The *Modus* was thus completed before the new general prohibitions, the *Rules* of the new Sistine *Index* (1590), were formulated. Its instructions are summarized in the Sistine *Rule* XXI. Furthermore, analogies in idea, form and aim between the *Modus* and the *Instructio de correctione librorum* (1596) of Clement VIII suggest the Sistine *Modus* was consulted and utilized for the preparation of the Clementine *Instructio*. This is interesting inasmuch as the Sistine *Index* was abrogated after the death of Sixtus V, apparently for the reason that the Sistine censorship policy was too severe. The *Index*, which was eventually published under Clement VIII, was based on the Tridentine version but included new condemnations and general regulations on the dealing with judicial astrology and Jewish books. At first this new *Index* seems more moderate than the Sistine one, yet a certain continuity in Roman censorship politics becomes evident from material like the Clementine *Instructio* and the Sistine *Modus*.[2]

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 11r–2r

Sixti Quinti Pontificis Maximi
Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri

Regula prima

Liber, qui expurgandus aut corrigendus est, saltem a tribus studiosis viris, accurate studioseque expurgetur, vel corrigatur. Id autem separatim uno, pluribusve foliis fiat, notatis paginis ac versibus libri, cuius expurgatio, vel correctio commissa est. Librum vero expurgatum, vel correctum ad Congregationem cardinalium a Sede Apostolica libris improbatae lectionis deputatorum referent,

1 See the entry dated 14 May 1587, in Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Diar. I, 21v: "Decretum lectis regulis expurgatoriis et examinatis earundem censuris ut remanerent sub illa verborum forma quam habes B fol. 11 et commissum Cardinali de Ruvere ut earundem regularum in bulla faceret mentione." On the text of the bull see Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 8r–v.

2 *ILI*, ix, 348.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/9789004301115_012

quorum erit expurgationem, vel correctionem examinare, et probare, prout ipsis visum fuerit.

Regula secunda

Quae vero, ut mox dictum est, expurgari, vel corrigi debent, haec sunt:

Omnes singulaeque propositiones haereticae, sapientes haeresim, erroneae, male sonantes, sive piarum aurium offensivae, temerariae, scandalosae, schismaticae, seditiosae, blasphemae contrariaeque bonis moribus, disciplinae christianae. Item omnes illae, quae circa ritus, et ceremonias sacramentorum aliquam novitatem inducunt contra receptum usum, et consuetudinem Catholicae Romanae Ecclesiae. Verba etiam ambigua, et dubia, quae legentium animos abducere possunt a recto catholico sensu ad nepharias opiniones. Verba Sacrae Scripturae ad usum prophanum prolata, seu detorta ad sensum a sanctorum patrum auctoritate alienum, item suspectae vocum novitates, et phrases, quibus saepe utuntur haeretici ad fallendum et demum omnia, quae docent sortilegia, somniorum interpretationes, divinandi modos, superstitiones, et eius generis alia, quibus hominum mentes facile depravantur, foedeque inficiuntur.

Regula tertia

Omnia, quae vel divinae providentiae, vel humanae libertati detrahunt, expurganda sunt, unde fortunae, et fati nomen ubique deleatur, ubi aliqua eis causalitas tribuitur.[3]

Regula quarta

In causa vero iurisdictionis diligenter consideranda omnia, quae iurisdictionem, potestatem, libertatem, atque immunitatem ecclesiasticam offendunt, vel minuunt, eaque moderanda, seu declaranda, prout praefatae Congregationi visum fuerit.

Regula quinta

In libris omnium recentiorum, et praesertim Apophtegmatum, Adagiorum, exemplorum, et reliquis huius generis delenda omnia, quae Ecclesiae laudabiles ritus contemnere, atque ecclesiasticarum personarum nomen laedere, vel dignitatem deprimere deprehendunt.

3 In marg.: *efficientia*.

Regula sexta

Expurgandi, vel corrigendi sunt non solum libri, vero annotationes, etiam marginales, figurae obscaenae libris insertae, Indices, Corollaria, Appendices, Censurae, Argumenta, Scholia, Summaria, Epistolae, et reliqua in libris expurgandis, vel corrigendis contenta.

Regula septima

Ex libris haereticorum, qui de religione non tractant, cum expurgandi sunt, delendae eorum epistolae ad haereticos, eorundem gesta, Imagines, Epitheta, laudes, et huiusmodi alia.[4]

Regula octava

Cum vero haeretici alicuius liber fuerit expurgatus, et a praefata Congregatione permissus, inscribatur illis initio titulus, quo primum significetur liber,[5] deinde Aucthor cum damnationis nota, ut liber recipi, Aucthor repudiari ostendatur,[6] et per damnationis notam ad *Indicem prohibitorum* revocetur. Tertio loco expurgatio, et permissio exprimatur. Exempli gratia Biblioteca a Conrado Gesnero Tigurino damnato Aucthore olim edita, nunc vero iussu superiorum ab erroribus expurgata, et permissa. Nemini vero liceat huiusmodi libros posterum nisi expurgatos, et permissos aedere.

Regula nona

In libris Catholicorum ante sacrosanctum Concilium Tridentinum aeditis, si aliqua occurrerint canonibus, et decretis eiusdem Concilii minus, consentanea, scholiis, vel marginibus ad dicti Concilii normam corrigantur, ut ea animadvertere possint lectores.

Regula decima

In omnium Catholicorum librorum correctione, maxime neothericorum, et praesertim eorum qui ab anno 1515 libros conscripserunt: si paucis additis, vel demptis, seu mutatis, propositiones catholicae, et quae bonum habeant sensum reddi possunt, id faciendum est. In veterum vero, sive Sanctorum Patrum, sive Ecclesiasticorum scriptorium, sive aliorum libris, nihil omnino mutetur, nisi quid mendi,[7] aut erroris irrepserit fraude, vitioque haereticorum, aut impressorum negligentia. Verum si aliqua occurrerint animadversione digna,

4 In marg.: *quod si haec in libris Catholicorum*.

5 In marg.: *illius* for *illis*.

6 Ibid.: *ostendat*.

7 Ibid.: *mutent*.

ea scholiis, annotationibus, marginalibus, seu aliis eorundem auctorum sententiis illustrentur.[8]

2.2 Bonardo's Discourse on the *Index*

Vatican, ACDF, Ind. Prot. B, 507r–11r

Vincenzo Bonardo, *Discorso intorno all'Indice da farsi de libri prohibiti* (1587)

Che l'Indice con le sue regole, si faccia latino, et anche volgare, accioché ognuno possa sapere, et intendere questo negotio.

Appresso tre cose principali occorrono da considerarsi per far un nuovo Indice, le Regole già fatte, Gli Auttori da prohibirsi, gli auttori che si possono espurgare.

Quanto alle regole, la pratica demostra chiaramente ch'è necessario il farvi alcune dechiarationi, et perché alla giornata si proporrano li dubbi che nascono intorno, a ciascheduno, et già s'è dato ordine d'essaminar la prima, et la seconda, non dirò altro perché di mano in mano s'essamineranno tutte, pongo però in consideratione la Bibbia volgare, se si debbe lasciar come le regole dicono, overo levare via affatto, com'è stato decretato.

Gli auttori da prohibirsi gli distinguo, perché, o sono heretici, o Catholici, et se heretici overo ex professo trattano de religione, overo occasionalmente et della prima sorte, si mette in consideratione, se trovandosi un libro delli loro buono per confermare qualche Dogma, fusse bene di lasciarlo per commodità di quelli che scrivono, accioché con heretici si potessero convincere altri heretici, et dire salutem ex inimicis nostris, li libri d'heretici della seconda sorte, vorrei, che si espurgassero, accioché come Santo Agostino disse ci servissemo delle Ricchezze dell' . . ., et loro hanno fatto molte et molte fatiche grandi, si mette però in consideratione, s'è bene di ridurli sotto altri titoli, et forma, come s'e fatto de gl'*Adagi* d'Erasmo.

Et si debbono scancellare omnino li nomi de gli heretici, et se questa espurgatione si dee fare per un colleggio de Theologi deputati in Roma a questo; il che sarebbe assai conforme alla grandezza della sedia Apostolica, overo commetterlo all'Università, o pur lasciar come sta nelle regole dell'Indice, cosa, che facilmente potrà partorire confusione, conciosiaché un medesimo libro, s'espurgherà in un vescovato, et da una inquisitione in un modo et diversamente da altri.

8 Ibid.: *scholia* instead of *scholiis*.

Se gli auttori sono Catholici, ma il libro è di poca utilità, o nissuna perché quella medesima Dottrina si può havere da altri auttori megliori, et vi sono dentro de gli errori, overo per il modo d'esplicar, i loro concetti, perché sono oscuri, et fastidiosi, possono più presto fare danno, et dare occasione d'errare più ch'altro, gli prohibirei, et da questo se ne cavarebbono due utilità, una per quelli che scrivono et stampano, che sarebbono per l'avvenire più accorti; l'altra per coloro che studiano, ch'oltra che avrebbono libri buoni alle mani, farrebbono benefitio alla borsa, comprandone manco; et all'Intelletto ancora studiandone pochi, et buoni, et in questo crederei, che fusse buono il procedere con qualche rigore, e tanto più, quanto che se si vuole attendere a espurgarli tutti, s'entra a fare una fatica infinita et forsi non molto utile.

De gli auttori heretici da metter nell'Indice, se non può haver notitia per l'Indice di Germania, nel quale ve ne sono 330. di più che nel nostro del concilio, per l'Indice di Spagna, et quello di Roma, et per gl'Indici delle fiere di Franchfort; dalli quali s'harà molta cognitione de libri de protestanti, et d'altri heretici. Per tanto sarebbe bene d'aver per via dei Nuntij, o, in altra maniera, tutti gl'Indici delle fiere passate, dal 1564. in qua; medesimamente sarebbe bene.

Scrivere alli Nuntij, che usassero diligenza per sapere, che Auttori hanno scritto, dal medesimo anno fin'al presente.

Scrivere a Monsignor di Santa Agata, che avvisi, che ordine tenne per venire in cognitione di quelli libri d'heretici, che sono di più nell'Indice fatto da lui, et se ne fece processo, et se n'a scritture che le mandi.

Giovanni Dei presentò a Papa Gregorio bonae memoriae un'Indice di molti libri, il quale aiutarà assai questo negotio.

V'è una lista de libri prohibiti, et suspetti, stampata in Parma, la quale se ben è quasi la medesima che quelli di Giovanni Dei, tuttavia ancora ella darà qualche aiuto.

Conrado (ancora) Licostene, con l'epithome della Biblioteca sua, potrà aiutare a conoscere gli autori, et qualità loro.

Per aver notitia de libri Cattolici, che non dimeno sono suspetti, et per li rispetti detti si debbono espurgare, o prohibire; si può fare diligenza in Roma, Venetia, Lione, et altri luoghi principali di stampe, per sapere, che libri sono usciti fuori da tanto tempo in qua, et quanto all'avere de libri, può servire Pietro Longo, principale mercante de libri in Venetia, et forsi che in Roma si ritroveranno mercanti de libri che serviranno.

Si può servire all'Inquisitione di Venetia, Milano et Bologna, che diano nota de libri che hanno nelli loro depositi, accioché si possano far venire quelli, che non havemo in Roma; Credo ancora che se si farà diligenza in Roma, per le librarie de privati, et publiche se ne troverà una gran parte.

Con questi aiuti et con credere, che non sarà mai possibile far tal'Indice, che levi via tutti li libri cattivi; perché mentre se ne prohibisce uno, se ne stampano due, et però l'Indice dee essere una cosa tale, che ogni quattro o cinque anni ve se ne agiungano delli altri, secondo che escono fuori delli nuovi; ho per cosa facile che presto si possa dare fuori un Indice assai buono, et rimediare a molti disordini.

Si mettono per fare questo Indice in consideratione molti libri de Romanzi, Battaglie, Canzoni, Historie, Barzellette, Capitoli, Orationi, representationi di Scrittura, libretti spirituali, li quali si vendono communemente, et sono tutto il giorno nelle mani di persone Idiote et Semplici, et non crederebbono mai le SS. VV. Illustrissimi il grande spaccio che se ne fa, et sono molti di loro pieni di errori (per non dire heresie), superstitioni, esempii cattivi, et altre Impertinenze assai, et volerli levare et prohibire affatto, è quasi Impossibile per esser divulgatissima questa pratica, et perché levarà il pane di mano a molti et dall'altra parte volerli emendare pare che sia troppa viltà, per tanto veggano le S S. VV. Illustrissime di pigliarvi qualche temperamento.

Crederei che fusse bene fare quanto più presto un Indice, et pubblicarlo per tutto, et per non esser Imputati di negligenza, commandar a tutti i Metropolitani, che dentro un tempo raggionevole facessero nelle loro provincie insieme con li comprovinciali, Inquisitori, et Theologi, diligenza di vedere s'hanno d'aggiungere altri auttori all'Indice già fatto, et ne mandassero a Roma alla Congregatione nota. Questo aiuterebbe a levar via gli auttori cattivi, darebbe notitia presto di quasi tutti li libri, e toglierebbe una grande fatiga.

Oltra che l'Invigilare con questa diligenza per tutto, serrarebbe la Strada assai all'Introdurre et portar libri cattivi. Si potrebbono dare loro alcune Instruttioni, et regole del modo come si dovrebbono governare, avvertendo, che si come delle Sinodi, che loro fanno, pigliano l'approbatione di Roma, così di Roma aspettassero il giuditio delle diligenze fatte da loro. Con questo mezzo credo io, che si remediaria assai, et facilissimamente ogni quattro, o cinque anni si potrebbe fare nova aggiunta all'Indice.

Si dovrebbe ordinare, che d'ogni libro, che si stampa, et escie fuori di novo, se ne disse copia al Metropolitano della provincia dove è stampato, accioché li facesse revedere, et ritrovandovi cosa contraria alle regole, che si faranno, si procedesse a castigare quelli, che hanno dato la licenza di stamparlo, et se questa Illustrissima Congregatione conoscera, che il Metropolitano non harà fatto il debito suo, proceda alla correttione di quello.

Si mette in consideratione ancora s'è bene di prohibire le Bibbie, e Testamenti novi sospetti, come fu fatto nell'Indice di Paolo Quarto bonae memoriae, così s'è bene far prohibitione de libri stampati da stampatori heretici e sospetti, come fu fatto all'hora et per me credo che quando si levasse questo commertio,

si toglieria ancora una grand'occasione de divulgare libri cattivi: et benché di questo si rechiameranno molti Mercanti de libri, tuttavia, è meglior la salute publica, che non sono le facultà d'alcuni pochi particulari, se ben anco si può provedere de farli menor danno, che sia possibile.

Per la terza parte dell'espurgationi sono moltissimi i libri da espurgarsi, et darà non poco fastidio il negotio di Raimondo Lullo che da Paolo Quarto fu prohibito, et da Pio quarto nell'Indice del Concilio fu lasciato a dietro. Ma specialmente si desiderano l'espurgationi del Zasio, Moulineo, Wesembevio, Sturfio, Sfriegellio, Cuiacio, Hindeldorfio, Hingendorfino, Hottomano, Duaremo, Corasio, Nicolò Clingio, Arnaldo de Villa Nova, Fuchsio, Cardano, Gesnero, la Biblioteca de animalibus, de Planetis, de fossilibus, il Vuolfio, Platina, Giovanni Fero, Giovanni Taulero, Francesco Giorgio, Battista da Crema, Thomasso Elisio, Mondogneto, Discorsi <…>, Theatrum vitae humanae, Theatrum orbis, Cosmografia del Munstero, Lettere di diversi, di Pietro Aretino, del Calmo, del Parabosco, Novelle del Sansovino, dello Strapparola, del Bandello, Dialogi di Sperone Speroni, Poetica, et Petrarca del Castelvetro, Selva Nuttiale, alcune cose d'Erasmo, Macchiavelo et molti altri, de quali l'Indice espurgatorio di Spagna et le censure che sono nell'offitio del Padre Maestro del sacro Palazzo ne possono dar notitia.

Nell'espurgar si vogliono levar via tutte le prohibitioni heretiche, suspette, et scandalose, tutte le cose superstitiose, contrarie a buoni costumi, li nomi degli heretici, quelle cose che inducono gli huomini ad attribuire troppo o a Cieli o alla fortuna o fato et simili altre, le maledicenze massime d'ecclesiastici et Principi, et qui è d'avertire, che volendo Vostra Signoria Espurgare il Theatro, nel quale sono raccolte tutte cose dette da diversi auttori, se le levate dal Theatro, subito v'è detto perché non le levate dal Sabellico, Fulgoso, Egineta, Paolo Emilio, Biondo, Platina, et altri, et se le volete levare da tutti, s'entra a guastare una quantità grande de libri, però questo se dee considerare molto bene.

S'ha d'attendere alle cose della Giurisdittione, et massime ecclesiastica, et qui è d'avvertire, che il prohibire, et levare perché parlino al contrario di quello che è giudicato il dovere pare ad alcuni che sia far forza, et farsi raggione con la potenza, il lasciare stare genera scandalo et dà troppa licenza, et questa sarà una briga sempre grande perché secondo l'occasione, et li luoghi, ne quali si scrive si favorisce più, et meno l'una et l'altra giurisdittione, però forsi basterebbe levare, che Concilium sit supra papam, che Imperator sit Superior, vel non dependeat, et simili proposizioni, et avvertire, che non intervenga, come disse Bartholo: Confitemur Donationem Constantini valere, quia sumus in terris ecclesiae.

Fatte tutte queste fatiche, per mantenersi più che sia possibile, bisogna trovare via, et modo, che da luoghi sospetti non passino libri fra Cattolici, et se

possibile è, si tolga affatto questo Commertio et bisogna avere spetialmente cura alli libri d'Humanità, Historie, Medicina, Leggi, perché questi sono hoggi Imbrattati al pari, o poco meno di quelli di Theologia.

Ne libri de Theologia s'ha d'aver gran cura alle Margini, Postille, Scholie, Argomenti, perché questi sono Imbrattate di molti errori. Bisogna aver cura, che si stampano molti libri in Genevra, Franchfort, Basilea, Perna, Tubinga, et altri luoghi d'heretici et si stampano corrotti et poi se gli fa la facciata per Parigi, Lione, Anversa, Colonia et altri luoghi de Cattolici, et si vendono per buoni.

Per tanto bisognerebbe in tutti i luoghi, ne quali sono stampate de Cattolici far nova deputatione, non solo per li libri che si stampano di novo, ma per quelli, che altre volte sono stati stampati, et rivederli, come si fa qui in Roma adesso, et vedere o con il modo del dare la licenza, o per altra via di rimediare a queste disordine, alquale non dà cosa alcuna maggior fomento, che la licenza della stampa, et la tanta libertà dello stampare.

Le stampe si dovrebbono tenere con più gelosia, che le Zecchi, et lo stampare che il battere le monete, et dovrebbono immediatamente dependere dal Principe. Però quando penso, che nello stato Ecclesiastico ciascheduno per che voglia, et possa, fa la stamperia, come qualsivoglia altra arte, che nel detto stato solo, è stampa in Roma, Tivoli, Ascoli, Viterbo, Orvieto, Perugia, Macerata, Fermo, Bologna, et altri luoghi, che non so io, non mi posso persuadere, che non nascano de disordini assai, et che quando non possono stampare delle cose buone, non stampino delle cattive, non si fingono li luoghi, et li nomi, per non esser colti in fallo, et per il medesimo rispetto non stampino senza luoghi et nomi et faccino mille altri disordini, alli quali sarebbe molto necessario il provedere.

In altri stati principali ne quali è maggior nervo di Stamperia perché il libro sia stato stampato una volta, et non sia nell'Indice, senz'altra licenza lo vogliono stampare, anzì che lo stampano contra le prohibitioni che se gli fanno.

Sopra tutto fatto l'Indice bisognerà procedere rigorosamente contra Librari, levandoli dalle mani tutti i libri prohibiti etiam de gli espurgandi, li quali si potranno tenere separatemente per renderli quando saranno espurgati così ancora levargleli dalle Balle, quando che gli fanno venire di fuori, et tenere tutte le vie possibile, perché si spenga la cattiva semenza de libri cattivi.

Ci sarebbono da dire assai altre cose, ma perché il trattare questo negotio le farà alla giornata scoprire, me le taccio et con farli humilissimente reverenza, finisco.

D.V. Illustrissima et Reverendissima
Devotissimo Servitore
Fra Vincenzo Bonardo

2.3 Valier's Letter to the Authors

Vatican, ACDF, Prot. M, 213r–7v/218r
Litterae Vulgares et Latinae Cardinalis Veronensis

Alli Autori. (excerpt)

In tante tenebre il lume naturale dell'Intelletto nostro per se stesso si debole e fiacco, che ben spesso servendosi de varij mezzi per venire in cognitione della verità e cagionando diverse opinioni conduce l'homo, che molto discorrendo parla o scrive in qualche errore notabile, o almeno in tal oscurezza, che da maggior raggio di luce alle volte poi illustrato vien forzato o, retrattarsi di qualche maldetto, come tra molti esempi fece Santo Agostino, overo dichiarar meglio il suo concetto, come fece san Tomasso d'Aquino Raro certo e singular esempio a tutti li scrittori cristiani, che non aspettando la censura d'altri overo da Dio esser Censurati per se stessi retrattano o, dichiarano quanto nelle cose loro offender' potesse la pietà et bontà christiana. Per il che questi miei Ill.mi ss.ri per il carico impostoli dalla Santa Sede apostolica di prohibir, et espurgar li libri stampati, et da stamparsi, che ciò per publico benefitio della religione christiana meritano, hanno dato ordine, che molti libri necessarij, et utili d'Autori già morti siano espurgati et si contentano, et vogliono per gratia particolare, che habbiate voi stesso a corregger' l'opere vostre conforme al modo, che da Mons.r Nuntio vi sarà dato, confidando, che Come homo Catholico, et Pio con ogni prontezza subito habbiate a ristampar corrette l'opere vostre, et approvate da Mons.r Nuntio Del che ne riportarete lode appresso il Mondo, et merito acquistarete apresso Idio Dal quale vi desidero ogni contento.

Bibliography

1 Primary Sources

1.1 *Manuscripts*

Dublin

Trinity College Library (*TCD*)

MS 1225, 81r–9r.

Rome

Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede (*ACDF*)

ANONYMOUS, 'Annotata super vulgares litteras', in Ind. Prot. F, 38r–43r.

ANONYMOUS, 'Censura nel libro del Boccaccio delle donne Illustri', in Ind. Prot. C, 367r.

ANONYMOUS, 'Censura super Decameron', in Ind. Prot. C, 360r–1v.

ANONYMOUS, 'Censurae' (Giovan Francesco Straparola, *Notti piacevoli*, Francesco Sansovino, *Cento novelle*, Giovanni Sabadino degli Arienti, *Novelle porretane*, Bandello, *Novelle*, Girolamo Parabosco, *I Diporti*, Giovanni Fiorentino, *Il Pecorone*), in Ind. XVIII, 205r–v.

ANONYMOUS, 'In septem libros Dianae Georgii de Montemaior et in secundam partem Gasparis Egidii Polo Censura', in Ind. Prot. C, 368r.

ANONYMOUS, 'Libro del Gigante Morante', in Ind. Prot. C, 320r.

Antonio Ciccarelli, 'Censura super dialogos di pulchritudine et amore Nicolai Viti ad Reverendum Patrem Sixtum Sacri Palatii Magistrum', in Ind. Prot. C, 339r–44r.

Bronzini, Christoforo, 'Dichiarazione del Bronzini d'Ancona', Autore del Dialogo della dignità e nobiltà delle donne, in Ind. Prot. H², 117r–28r.

Di Dio, Giovanni, 'Index Authorum, qui vel aperte haeretici sunt aut certe de haeresi valde suspecti esse videntur aut contra bonos mores vitaeque pudicitiam aliqua continent. Postremo etiam addita sunt opera sanctorum doctorum sive etiam prophanorum, quae ratione impressionis aut interpretis sive quod scholia atque annotationes haeretici alicuius authoris contineant minus probanda videntur' (Rome, 1576), in Ind. XIV (1 unit.).

Galletti, Tommaso, 'Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto', in Ind. Prot. N, 304v–8v.

Guarini da Centula, Vincenzo, 'In commentaria Lodovici Castelvetri Mutinensis super Poeticam Aristotelis Italica lingua conscripta castigationis', in *Ind. Prot.* N, 349r–352v.

Index, Diarii 1 (Paolo Pico, 'Registrum omnium decretorum et actorum Sacrae Congregationis Illustrissimorum et Reverendorum Dominorum Cardinalium Deputatorum super Indice librorum improbatae lectionis et expurgatione librorum

impressorum et imprimendorum, quae omnia in unum congesta et ordinata fuere et in presenti volumine descripta opera fratris Pauli Pici sacrae theologiae professoris Ordinis Praedicatorum eiusdem Congregationis Secretarii'.)
Ioannis Andreas Dionus, 'Copia correctionis libri Simonis Fornarii de Reggio super Ludovicum Ariostum', in Ind. Prot. N, 295r–300v.
Inquisition of Ferrara, 'Correttione dell'Orlando Furioso di Lodovico Ariosto', in Ind. Prot. N, 314r–6v.
[Inquisition of Ferrara], 'Censura sopra le Ricchezze della lingua volgare' [Francesco Alunno]', in Ind. Prot. C, 348r–v.
Inquisition of Perugia, 'Censurae' [Ariosto, *Satire*, Francesco Sansovino, *Satire*, Ercole Bentivoglio, *Satire*, Ludovico Paterno, *Satire*, Antonfrancesco Doni, *La Zucca, La filosofia morale*, Francesco Alunno, *Ricchezze della lingua volgare*], in Ind. Prot. O, 638r–682v.
Inquisition of Venice, 'Correttioni fatte nel commento di Lodovico Castelvetro sopra la Poetica d'Aristotele', ab inquisitore Veneto transmisse, in Ind. Prot. N, 328r–9v.
Marcantonio Marcello, 'Correttioni fatte nel Commento di Lodovico Castelvetro sopra la Poetica d'Aristotele', in Ind. Prot. N, 328r–9v.
Sanctum Officium, Stanza Storica, O 1 a and Q 3-d.
Sixtus V, *Modus, et ratio, vel corrigendi libri* [1587], in Ind. Prot. B, 11r–2r.

Vatican Library (*BAV*)

ANONYMOUS, 'Censura Johannis Tauleri Dogmata' [1585], in Cod. Vat. *Lat*. 6149, 147r, 150v (front cover, double page numbers).
ANONYMOUS, 'In libros XII Observationes Joannis Drusii', in Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, 139r–40v, 147v.
Barrio, Gabriele, 'De Petrarcha' [incl. Dante, Ariosto, Sannazaro], in *Cod. Vat. Lat*. 6149, 141r–6v, 147r–50v.
Paleotti, Gabriele, 'Libri nonnulli qui videntur indigere emendatione, nec sunt comprehensi in Indice Romano', in Cod. Vat. Lat. 6191, 246r–7r.
Ranaldi, A., 'Inventarium manuscriptorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae', 1627.
[Sirleto, Guglielmo?], 'Memoriale', in Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, 175r–v.

Venice

Archivio di Stato (*ASV*)

Barbaro, Marco, *Arbori dei Patritii Veneti*.
Consiglio dei Dieci, Notatorio.
Esecutori contro la Bestemmia, Notatorio 2, Terminazioni 56.
Riformatori di Stato, Licenze di stampa, busta 284.
Provveditori della Sanità, Necrologio, busta 813.

Savi sopra decime, busta 157.
Sant'Uffizio, buste 23, 32, 40, 156, 159, 160, 161.
Segretario alle voci, Registro, busta 12.

National Library of St Mark's (*BNM*)

Venier, Domenico, *Canzoniere*, in Marc. It. IX, 589 (9765) (autograph).
Id. et al., 'Rime', in Marc. It. IX, 248 (7071).
ANONYMOUS, 'Quante et quali sieno le cose levate nella seconda stampa dalla Poetica di m. Lodovico modenese a compiacimento d'alcuni troppo scropulosi di questo misero secolo', in Cod. Marc. It. XI, 180 (6523), 147r–v.
Magno, Celio, 'Rime', in Marc. It. IX, 171 (6092) (autograph).

1.2 *Printed*

Adnotationes in regulas de indice librorum, 27 November 1563, in *Concilium Tridentinum*, xiii.2.1, 606–7.
Albertino, Arnaldo, *De agnoscendis assertionibus Catholicis et haereticis tractatus*, auctor Arnaldo Albertino Maioricensi, olim Episcopo Pactensi et Citerioris Siciliae Apostolico Inquisitore, nunc denuo post omnes editiones recognitus (Rome: in aedibus popoli Romani, 1572).
Alexander of Hales, *Summa universae theologiae* (Pavia: Giovanni Antonio Beretta et Francesco Girardengo, 1489).
Alighieri, Dante, *Convivio*, ed. Franca Brambilla Ageno (Florence: Casa Ed. Le Lettere, 1995), vol. 2: testo.
——— *Vita Nuova*, ed. Domenico de Robertis (Milan: Ricciardi, 1980).
——— *Vita Nuova*, ed. Michele Barbi (Florence: Bemporad, 1932).
——— *Dante con l'espositioni di Christoforo Landino et d'Alessandro Vellutello, sopra la sua Comedia dell'Inferno, del Purgatorio et del Paradiso* (Venice: Gio. Battista et Gio. Bernardo Sessa, bros., 1596).
——— *Vita nuova di Dante Alaghieri* [sic], *Con XV canzoni del medesimo e la vita di esso Dante scritta da Giovanni Boccaccio* (Florence: Stamperia di Bartolomeo Smartelli, 1576).
——— *Dante con l'espositione di M. Bernardino Daniello da Lucca sopra la sua Comedia dell'Inferno, del Purgatorio et del Paradiso* [Venice: Pietro da Fino, 1568].
Alunno, Francesco, *Le Ricchezze della lingua volgare sopra il Boccaccio* (Venice: Appresso Giovan Maria Bonelli, 1555).
Antoniano, Silvio, *Dell'educazione christiana e politica de' figliuoli libri tre* (Florence: Tipografia della Casa di Correzione, 1852).
Antoninus, *Opera di Santo Antonino Arcivescovo fiorentino, da lui medesimo composta in volgare, utilissima, et necessaria alla instruttione delli sacerdoti, et di qualunque altra persona, laquale desidera sapere vivere christianamente, et confessarsi bene de*

gli suoi peccati, nuovamente ristampata, et da infiniti errori emendate (Venice: M. Marchio Sessa, 1551).

——— *Chronica, sive opus historiarum* (Basel: Nicolaus Keßler, 1502)

Ariosto, Ludovico, *Orlando furioso*, ed. Remo Ceserani, and Sergio Zatti (Turin: UTET, 2006), vols 1–2.

——— *Opere minori*, ed. Cesare Segre (Milan: Ricciardi, 1954).

Id., *Orlando furioso di m. Lodovico Ariosto*, Nuovamente adornato di Figure di Rame da Girolamo Porro Padovano et di altre cose che saranno notate nella seguente facciata (= Annotationi, avvertimenti e dichiarationi di Ieronimo Ruscelli, la vita dell'auttore, descritta dal Signor Giovan Battista Pigna, scontri de' luoghi mutati dall'auttore dopo la sua prima impressione, dichiaratione di tutte l'Istorie, & favole toccate nel presente libro di M. Nicolò Eugenico, tavola de'principi di tutte le stanze. Aggiuntovi di nuovo: L'Osservationi sopra tutto l'Ariosto del Signor Alberto Lavezuola, la vita dell'Ariosto, descritta da M. Giacomo Garofolo, una allegoria universale sopra tutta l'opera dell'Ariosto fatta da Giuseppe Bononome, gli epiteti, o aggiuntovi usati dall'Ariosto, raccolti, & disposti per ordine d'alfabeto da Camillo Camilli) (Venice: Francesco de Franceschi Senese e compagni, 1584).

——— *Orlando furioso*, nuovamente ristampato et ricorretto, con nuovi argomenti di M. Lodovico Dolce, con la vita dell'autore di M. Simon Fórnari, il vocabolario delle voci più oscure, le imitatione cavate dal Dolce, le nuove allegorie et annotationi di M. Tomaso Porcacchi et con due tavole, una delle cose notabili, l'altra de' nomi proprii (Venice: Domenico et Giovan Battista Guerra, 1570).

——— *Orlando furioso di m. Lodovico Ariosto*, tutto ricorretto et di nuove figure adornato, con le annotationi, gli avvertimenti et le dichiarationi di Girolamo Ruscelli, la vita dell'autore, descritta dal Signor Giovan Battista Pigna, gli scontri de' luoghi mutati dall'autore doppo la sua prima impressione, il vocabolario di tutte le parole oscure et altre cose utili et necessarie. Aggiuntavi in questa seconda impressione la dichiaratione di tutte le istorie et favole toccate nel presente libro, fatta da Nicolo Eugenico (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1566).

——— *Orlando furioso di m. Lodovico Ariosto, con cinque nuovi canti del medesimo*, ornato di figure et con queste aggiuntioni, vita dell'auttore scritta per m. Simon Fórnari (Venice: G.A. Valvassori, 1566).

——— *Orlando furioso* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1558).

——— *Orlando furioso con i cinque canti* (Venice: Giolito, n.d. [*c*.1550–1552]).

——— *Orlando furioso di m. Lodovico Ariosto con l'aggiunta di cinque canti d'un nuovo libro del medesimo, ornato di varie figure, con tutte le cose che nelle nostre impressioni si leggono ove sono cinquecento e più vocaboli emendati, secondo l'originale del proprio Autore* (Venice: Gabriele Giolito, 1552).

——— *Rime di M. Lodovico Ariosto. Satire del medesimo con i suoi argomenti di nuovo rivedute et emendate* (Venice: Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari, 1560).

Arrivabene, Andrea (ed.), *Libro terzo delle rime di diversi nobilissimi et eccellentissimi autori*, nuovamente raccolte (Venice: Cesano al segno del Pozzo, 1550).

Atanagi, Dionigi (ed.), *De le rime di diversi nobili poeti toscani, raccolte da M. Dionigi Atanagi*, book three (Venice: Lodovico Avanzo, 1565).

Augustine, *Sermo* 199, in id., *Predigten zu Neujahr und Epiphanie* (*Sermones 196/A–204/A*) (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2010).

——— *De musica*, Bücher I und VI; vom ästhetischen Urteil zur metaphysischen Erkenntnis, trans. Frank Hentschel (Hamburg: Meiner, 2002).

——— *De civitate Dei*, trans. Carl Johann Perl (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979), 2 vols.

——— *De beata vita*, in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Contra academicos, De beata vita, De origine, De magistro, De libero arbitrio*, ed. W.M. Green (Turnhout: Brepols, 1970).

——— *De haeresibus, ad Quodvultdeum*, book 1, ed. R. Vander Plaetse, and C. Beukers, in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De fide rerum invisibilium, Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et charitate, De catechizandis rudibus, Sermo ad catechumenos de symbolo, Sermo de disciplina Christiana, Sermo de utilitate ieiunii, Sermo de excidio Urbis Romae, De haeresibus* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).

——— *De doctrina Christiana libri quattuor*, in id., *Opera*, sect. VI, pars VI, ed. Guilelmus M. Green (Vienna: Hoelder, Pichler, Tempsky, 1963).

——— *De civitate Dei*, *De civitate Dei*, ed. Bernardus Dombart, and Alphonsus Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955).

——— *De fide et symbolo, De fide et operibus, De agone christiano, De continentia, De bono coniugali, De sancta virginitate, De bono viduitatis, De adulterinis coniugiis libri II, De mendacio, Contra mendacium, De opere monachorum, De divinatione daemonum, De cura mortuis gerenda, De patientia*, ed. Josephus Zycha (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1900).

Barrio, Gabriele, *Pro lingua latina libri tres, De aeternitate Urbis, De laudibus Italiae* (Rome: In Aedibus Populi Romani, 1571).

——— *Pro lingua latina libri tres, De aeternitate Urbis, De laudibus Italiae* (Rome: D. Hieronymus de Cartulariis, 1554).

Bellarmine, Robert, *Opera omnia*, ed. Justinus Fevrè, reprint (Frankfurt/Main: Minerva-Verlag, 1965).

——— *De gemitu columbae sive de bono lachrymarum*, libri tres (Lyons: Horatius Cardon, 1617).

——— *Varii argumenti opuscula* (Cologne: Bernardus Gualtherus, 1617).

——— *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, in ibid.

——— *Responsio ad librum quondam anonymum cuius titulus est Avviso piacevole dato alla bella Italia*, in ibid.

——— *De sacramentis in genere*, in id., *Disputationum Roberti Bellarmini Politiani, S.R.E. Cardinalis de controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, tomus tertius (Paris: Ex Officinis Tri-Adelphorum Bibliopolarum, 1613).

——— *Disputationum Roberti Bellarmini Politiani S.J., S.R.E. cardinalis de controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, tomus secundus (Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorius, 1591).

——— *Prose e rime*, ed. Carlo Dionisotti (Turin: UTET, 1992).

——— *Prose della volgar lingua, Gli Asolani, Rime*, ed. Carlo Dionisotti (Turin: UTET, 1966).

Bembo, Pietro, *Rime* (Venice: Francesco Sansovino, 1561).

Bernardo of Como, *Lucerna Inquisitorum Haereticae Pravitatis R.P.F. Bernardi Comensis Ordinis Praedicatorum et eiusdem Tractatus de Strigibus*, cum annotationibus Francisci Pegnae sacrae theologiae et iuris utriusque doctoris (Venice: Marco Zaltieri, 1596).

——— *Lucerna Inquisitorum Haereticae Pravitatis R.P.F. Bernardi Comensis Ordinis Praedicatorum et eiusdem tractatus De strigibus*, cum annotationibus Francisci Pegnae sacrae theologiae et iuris utriusque doctoris (Rome: Bartolomeo Grassi, 1584).

Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria, introduction by Karlfried Froehlich and Margaret T. Gibson (Rusch: Adolph, 1480/1, facs. edn., Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Genealogia: Boccaccio in Defense of Poetry, Genealogia deorum gentilium liber XIV*, ed. Jeremiah Reedy (Toronto: Hunter Rose, 1978).

Borgogni, Gherardo, *Rime di diversi illustri poeti de' nostri tempi*, di nuovo poste in luce (Venice: Presso la Minima Compagnia, 1599).

Bullarium diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum, Taurinensis editio, ed. Francisco Gaude (Turin: Franco, Fory and Dalmazzo, 1859), iv.

Magnum Bullarium Romanum seu eiusdem continuatio (Luxemburg: Andrea Chevalier, 1730), ix.

Magnum Bullarium Romanum, a beato Leone Magno usque ad S.D.N. Benedictum XIII, opus absolutissimum Laertii Cherubini (Luxemburg: Andrea Chevalier, 1727), i.

Magnum Bullarium Romanum, ab Leone Magno usque ad S.D.N. Clementem X. opus absolutissimum Laertii Cherubini praestantissimi iurisconsulti Romani, et a D. Angelo Cherubino monacho Cassinensi nunc denuo illustratum et recensitum, editio novissima, quatuor tomis distributa, vitis et iconibus aeneis omnium pontificum decorata, tomus primus-secundus (Lyons: Philippe Borde, Laurent Arnaud, et Claude Rigaud 1655).

Bullarium Romanum novissimum, ab Leone Magno usque ad S.D.N. Urbanum VIII, Opus absolutissimum Laertii Cherubini praestantissimi iurisconsulti Romani tertio nunc editum a D. Angelo Maria Cherubino monacho Cassinensi qui ut in altera editione quartum tomum perfecit ita nunc constitutiones S.D.N. Urbani VIII usque hanc diem emanatas addidit (Rome: Typographia Rev. Camerae Apostolicae, 1638).

Cappello, Bernardo, *Rime* (Venice: Domenico et Giovan Battista Guerra, fratelli, 1560).

Cardona, Juan Bautista, *De expungendis haereticorum propriis nominibus etiam de libris qui de religione ex professo non tractant* (Rome: Giuseppe de Angelis, 1576).

Caro, Annibal, *Apologia de gli Accademici di Banchi di Roma, contra M. Lodovico Castelvetro da Modena* (Parma: Seth Viotti, 1558).

Castelvetro, Ludovico, *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata, et sposta* (Vienna: Gaspare Stainhofer, 1570, facs. edn., Munich: Fink, 1968).

——— *Le rime del Petrarca brevemente sposte*, ed. Guido Baldassari (Venice: Antonio Zatta, 1756).

——— *Poetica d'Aristotele, vulgarizzata et sposta per Lodovico Castelvetro* (Basel: Pietro de Sebadonis, 1576).

——— *Ragione d'alcune cose segnate nella canzone d'Annibal Caro* Venite a l'ombra de gran gigli d'oro (Parma: Seth Viotti, 1573).

——— *Poetica d'Aristotele, vulgarizzata et sposta per Lodovico Castelvetro* (Vienna d'Austria: Stainhofer, 1570).

Castiglione, Baldassare, *Il Cortegiano*, Riveduto et corretto da Antonio Ciccarelli da Fuligno, Dottore in Teologia (Venice: Bernardo Basa, 1584).

——— *Il Cortegiano* (Venice: s. i., 1562).

——— and Gonzaga, Cesare, *Stanze pastorali*, con le *Rime* di m. Anton Giacomo Corso (Venice: Aldi eredi, 1553).

Castro, Alphonso de, *Adversus omnes haereses libri* XIIII (Antwerp: In aedibus viduae et haeredum Ioannis Stelsii, 1565).

Clement of Rome, *Epistola ad Corinthios* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994).

Colonna, Vittoria, *Tutte le rime*, con l'espositione del Signor Rinaldo Corso nuovamente mandate in luce da Girolamo Ruscelli (Venice: Giovan Battista e Melchior Sessa Fratelli, 1558).

Concilii Tridentini tractatuum, pars 2.1: *Complectens tractatus a translatione concilii usque ad sessionem XXII conscriptos*, ed. Hubertus Jedin, in *Concilium Tridentinum: diariorum, actorum, epistolarum, tractatuum nova collectio*, ed. by Societas Goerresiana (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1938), xiii.

Concilii Tridentini Actorum, pars 6: *Complectens acta post sessionem sextam* (*XXII*) *usque ad finem Concilii* (*17. Sept. 1562–4. Dec. 1563*), ed. Stephan Ehses, in *Concilium Tridentinum*: diariorum, actorum, epistolarum edidit Societas Goerresiana (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924), ix.

Concilium Tridentini Epistularum, pars 1: Complectens epistulas a die 5 martii 1545 ad Concilii translationem 11 martii 1547 scriptas, collegit, editi, illustravit Godofredus Buschbell, in *Concilium Tridentinum* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1916), x.

Decretum Magistri Gratiani, ed. Aemilius Friedberg (2nd edn., Leipzig: Ex Officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1879).

Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien, ed. Josef Wohlmuth (3rd edn., Paderborn: Schöningh, 1973), 3 vols.

Della Casa, Giovanni and Gualteruzzi, Carlo, *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa—Carlo Gualteruzzi* (*1525–1549*), ed. Ornella Moroni (Vatican City: Vatican Apostolic Library, 1986).

Doni, Antonfrancesco, *La Filosofia morale tratta da molti degni scrittori antichi prudenti* (Venice: Appresso li heredi di Marchio Sessa, 1567).

Ebreo, Leone, *Dialoghi d'amore*, ed. Santino Caramella (Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1929).

Episcopale Bononensis civitatis et diocesis, raccolta di varie cose, che in diversi tempi sono state ordinate da Monsignor Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Cardinale Paleotti, Vescovo di Bologna, per lo buon della sua città et diocese (Bologna: Alessandro Benacci, 1580).

Eymerich, Nicolaus, *Directorium inquisitorum*, cum commentariis Francisci Pegne sacrae theologiae ac iuris utriusque doctoris, ad S.D.N. Gregorium XIII. Pont. Max. (Venice: Marcantonio Zaltieri, 1607).

——— *Directorium inquisitorum*, cum commentariis Francisci Pegnae sacrae theologiae ac iuris utriusque doctoris (Rome: In aedibus Populi Romani, 1585).

Fenaruolo, Girolamo, *Rime* (Venice: Giorgio Angelieri, 1574).

Fiamma, Gabriele, *Rime spirituali*, con l'espositione di lui medesimo (Venice: Francesco de' Franceschi, 1575).

Ficino, Marsilio, *The Letters of Marsilio Ficino*, trans. members of the Department of the School of Economic Science, London (London: Shepheard-Walwyn, 1978), i.

Flacium, Matthias, *Catalogus testium veritatis, qui ante nostram aetatem Pontefici Romano, eiusque erroribus reclamarunt: iam denuo longe quam antea & emendatior et auctior editus, cum praefatione Mathiae Flacii Illyrici, qua Operis huius & ratio & usus exponitur* ([Basel] Argentinae: Oporinus, 1562).

Fornari, Simon, *La Sposizione di m. Simon Fórnari sopra l'Orlando furioso di m. Ludovico Ariosto* (Venice: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1549–50).

Frachetta, Girolamo, *Breve sposizione di tutta l'opera di Lucrezio*, nella quale si disamina la dottrina di Epicuro e si mostra in che sia conforme col vero e con gl'insegnamenti d'Aristotile, et in che differente (Venice: Pietro Paganini, 1589).

Gherardo, Paolo (ed.), *Nuovo libro de Lettere delli più rari autori della lingua volgare Italiana* (Venice: Per Paolo Gherardo, 1545).

Giovannini da Capugnano, Girolamo, *Vita di fra Paolo Costabili, Maestro Generale dell'Ordine de' Predicatori* (Venice: Fabio e Agostino Zoppino, 1586).

Giustinian, Paulo and Querini, Pietro, *Libellus ad Leonem x Pontificem Maximum*, in *Annales Camaldulenses Ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, ix (Venice: Monasterium Sancti Michaelis de Muriano, 1773).

Glossa ordinaria, pars 22: *In Cantico canticorum*, ed. Mary Dove (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).

Vito di Gozze, Niccolò, *Dialogo d'amore detto Antos, secondo la mente di Platone* (Venice: Francesco Ziletti, 1581).

——— Dialogo della bellezza detto Antos, secondo la mente di Platone (Venice: Francesco Ziletti, 1581).

Gregorio Cappucino, *Enchiridion Ecclesiasticum, sive praeparatio pertinens ad Sacramentum Poenitentiae et sacri Ordinis*, editum a Gregorio Cappucino Neapol. uno ex Deputatis Patribus pro Revisione Librorum in Civitate Neapoli. Per Illustrissimum e Reverendissimum Arciepiscopum (Venice: Girolamo Polo, 1588).

Sancti Gregori Magni expositiones in Cantica canticorum, in librum primum Regum, ed. Patricius Verbraken O.S.B. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963).

Jacobi Gretseri Societatis Iesu Theologi, *De iure et more prohibendi, expurgandi, et abolendi libros haereticos et noxios*, Adversus Franciscum Iunium Calvinistam, et Ioannem Pappum, aliosque Praedicantes Lutheranos (Ingolstadt: Ex officina typographicy Ederina, per Andream Angermarium, 1603).

Grillandus, Paulus, *Tractatus de hereticis et sortilegis omnifariam coitu eorumque penis* (Lyons: Giacomo Giunti, 1545).

Guarini, Battista, *Opere*, ed. Marziano Guglielminetti (2nd edn., Turin: UTET, 1971).

Guittone d'Arezzo, *Canzoniere. I sonetti d'amore del codice laurenziano*, ed. by Lino Leonardi (Turin: Einaudi, 1994).

Index des livres interdits, ed. J.M. De Bujanda (Montréal: Médiaspaul, 1984–2002).

Index Romanus. Verzeichnis sämtlicher auf dem römischen Index stehenden deutsprachlichen Bücher desgleichen aller wichtigen fremdsprachlichen Bücher seit dem Jahre 1750, zusammengestellt auf Grund der neuesten vatikanischen Ausgabe sowie mit ausführlicher Einleitung versehen von Albert Sleumer (11th edn., Osnabrück: J. Jonscher, 1956).

Irenaeus, *Libros quinque adversus haereses*, ed. W. Wigan Harvey (Cambridge: Typis Academicis, 1857).

The Jewish Study Bible, eds. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Luther, Martin, *De servo arbitrio/Vom unfreien Willensvermögen*, trans. Athina Lexutt, in id., *Der Mensch vor Gott*, ed. Wilfried Härle (Leipzig: Evang. Verl.-Anst., 2006).

Magno, Celio, *Prefazione sopra il Petrarca* (*ms. Marc. It.* IX, 171), in Taddeo, Edoardo, *Il manierismo letterario e i lirici veneziani del tardo Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974), 221–232.

——— and Giustinian, Orsatto, *Rime di Celio Magno e Orsatto Giustiniano* (Venice: Andrea Muschio, 1600).

Malipiero, Girolamo, *Il Petrarca spirituale* (Venice: Francesco Marcolini da Forli, 1536).

Mansi, Joannes D., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Paris: Hubertus Welter, 1902), vols. 32 and 35.

——— *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Florence: Zatta, 1759ss), 53 vols.

[Benavides, Marco Mantova,] *Annotationi brevissime, sovra le rime di M.F.P* (Padua: Appresso Lorenzo Pasquale, 1566.

Manuzio, Antonio (ed.), *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie* (Venice: Aldo, 1550).

Manuzio, Paolo (ed.), *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini, et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie, con la giunta del terzo libro, nuovamente ristampate, et in più luoghi corrette. Libro primo* (Venice: Paolo Manuzio, 1564).

Id., *Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini, et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie*. Nuovamente ristampate, et in più luoghi corrette. Libro primo (Venice: In casa di figliuoli di Aldo, 1551).

Masini, Eliseo, *Sacro Arsenale* (Rome: Stamperia della Camera Apostolica, 1704).

Menghi, Girolamo, *Compendio dell'arte essorcistica et possibilità delle mirabili et stupende operationi delli demoni et de' Malefici*, con li rimedi opportuni alle infermità Maleficiali (Venice: Pietro Bertano, 1605).

——— *Flagellum daemonum exorcismos terribiles, potentissimos et efficaces*, remedia probatissima ac doctrinam singularem in malignos spiritus expellendos, facturasque et maleficia fuganda de obsessis corporis complectens. Accessit postremo Pars secunda, quae *Fustis Daemonum* inscribitur (Bologna: Giovanni Rossi, 1584).

Minturno, Antonio Sebastiano, *L'arte poetica* (Venice: Giovanni Andrea Valvassori, 1564, facs. edn., Munich: Fink 1971).

——— *De Poeta*, ad Hectorem Pignatellum Vibonensium Ducem libri sex, reprint (Munich: Fink, 1970).

Molin, Girolamo, *Rime* (Venice: [Comin da Trino], 1573).

Montaigne, Michel de, *Journal de Voyage en Italie par la Suisse et l'Allemagne en 1580 et 1581*, ed. by Maurice Rat (Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères, 1942).

Noctes Vaticanae seu sermones habiti in Academia A S. Carolo Borromeo Romae in Palatio Vaticano instituta. Praemittitur opusculum Augustini Valerii inscriptum Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum, ed. Joseph Antonius Saxius (Milan: ex Typographia Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, apud Joseph Marellum, 1748).

Ottonelli, Giulio, *Il Dorateo: Dialogo contro allo scriver men cristiano*, pubblicato per la prima volta dal C.M.V. (Modena, 1826).

——— *Discorso sopra l'abuso del dire Sua Santità, Sua Maestà, Sua Altezza, senza nominare il Papa, l'Imperadore, il Principe, con le Difese della Gerusalemme Liberata dalle opposizioni degli Accademici della Crusca* (Ferrara: Giulio Vasellini, 1585).

Paleotti, Gabriele, *De imaginibus sacris et profanis, libri quinque, quibus multiplices earum abusus iuxta sacrosancti Concili Tridentini decreta deteguntur* (Ingolstadii: David Sartorius, 1594).

Parabosco, Girolamo, *Lettere amorose* (Venice: Giolito, 1545).

Pasqualigo, Alvise, *Lettere amorose* (Venice: Francesco Sansovino, 1570).

——— *Delle lettere amorose libri quattro nei quali sotto meravigliosi concetti si contengono tutti gli accidenti d'amore* (Venice: Egidio Regazzola e Domenico Cavalcalupo compagni, 1570).

——— *Delle lettere amorose di due nobilissimi intelletti libri due. Ne' quali leggendosi una historia continuata d'un amor fervente di molti anni tra due fedelissimi Amanti, si contien ciò che può avvenire a qualunque persona questa materia* (Venice: Rampazetto, 1563).

Paulus, Julius, *Libri sententiarum*, in *Titi Gaii Institutionum Iuliique Pauli Sententiarum* (Paris: Via ad divum Iacobum, 1525).

Peña, Francisco, *Annotationes in Tractatum de strigiis Bernardi Comensis*, in Bernardo of Como, *Lucerna inquisitorum haereticae pravitatis R.P.F. Bernardi Comensis Ordinis Praedicatorum et eiusdem tractatus De strigibus*, cum annotationibus Francisci Pegnae sacrae theologiae et iuris utriusque doctoris (Rome: Bartolomeo Grassi, 1584).

[Perrot, François], *Aviso piacevole dato alla bella Italia da un nobile giovane francese, sopra la mentita data dal Serenissimo Re di Navarra a Papa Sisto V* [London: John Wolfe], 1586.

Petrarca, Francesco, *Canzoniere*, ed. by Alberto Chiari (Rome: Mondadori, 1992).

——— *Il Petrarcha con l'espositione d'Alessandro Vellutelo*, di novo ristampato con le figure a i *Triomphi* et con più cose utili in varii luoghi aggiunte (Venice: Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari, 1573).

——— *Sonetti, canzoni e triomphi*, con la spositione di Bernhardino Daniello da Lucca (Venice: Giovanniantonio de Nicolini da Sabio, 1541).

——— *Trionfi, Rime estravaganti, codice degli abbozzi*, ed. Vinicio Pacca and Laura Paolino (Milan: Mondadori, 1996).

——— *Le volgari opere del Petrarcha con la spositione di Alessandro Vellutello da Lucca* (Venice: Giovanniantonio et fratelli da Sabbio, 1525).

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni, *De hominis dignitate/Über die Würde des Menschen*, Latin/German (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1997).

Pico della Mirandola, Giovan Francesco, *La strega ovvero degli inganni dei demoni* (Milan: G. Daelli e C. editori, 1864).

Pius IV, *Dominici gregis custodiae*, in *ILI*, viii.

Possevino, Antonio, *Bibliotheca selecta, qua agitur de ratione studiorum in historia, in disciplinis, in salute omnium procuranda* (Rome: Domenico Basa, Stamperia Vaticana, 1593).

Puy-Herbault, Gabriel de, *Von Verbot und Auffhebung deren Buecher und Schriften, so in gemain one nachtheil und verletzung des gewissens auch der frumb und erbarkeit nit moegen gelesen oder behalten werden* (Munich: Adam Berg, 1581).

——— *Theotimus sive de tollendis et expungendis malis libris, iis praecipue, quos vix incoluni fide ac pietate plerique legere queant* (Paris: Jean de Roigny, 1549).

Quiroga, Gasparis, *Index Librorum Expurgatorum* (Madrid: apud Alphonsum Gomezium, 1584).

[*Regulae generales*, before 27 November 1563], in *Concilium Tridentinum*, xiii.2.1, 603–6.

Robortello, Francesco, *In librum Aristotelis De arte poetica explications* (Florence: Lorenzo Torrentino, 1548, facs. edn., Munich: Fink, 1968).

Ruscelli, Girolamo (ed.), *I fiori delle rime de' poeti illustri* (Venice: Giovanbattista et Melchior Sessa, fratelli 1558).

——— (ed), *I fiori delle rime de' poeti illustri* (Venice: Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari, 1556).

——— (ed.), *Tempio alla divina Signora Giovanna d'Aragona*, all'Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Signore, il Signor Cristoforo Madruccio, Cardinal di Trento (Venice: Plinio Pietrasanta, 1555).

——— *Il sesto libro delle rime di diversi eccellenti autori, nuovamente raccolte et mandate in luce. Con un discorso di Girolamo Ruscelli* (Venice: Al segno del Pozzo, 1553).

Salutati, Coluccio, *De laboribus Herculis*, vol. 1, ed. by B.L. Ullman (Turici: Thesaurus mundi, 1951).

Sannazaro, Jacopo, *The Major Latin Poems of Jacopo Sannazaro*, trans. by Ralph Nash (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996).

——— *Sonetti e canzoni*, in id., *Opere volgari*, ed. by Alfredo Mauro (Bari: Laterza, 1961).

——— *Opere*, con saggi dell'*Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* di Francesco Colonna e del Peregrino di Iacopo Caviceo, a cura di Enrico Carrara (Turin: UTET, 1970).

Sansovino, Francesco, *Sette libri di satire* (Venice: Giacomo Vidali, 1573).

——— *Del secretario, libri VII, nel quale si mostra et insegna il modo di scriver lettere acconciamente e con arte, in qual si voglia soggetto* (Venice: Matteo Valentini, 1608).

——— *Delle lettere amorose di diversi huomini illustri, libri nove* (n. p, n. d.).

Scriniolum Sanctae Inquisitionis Astensis (Asti: Virgilio Giangrandi, 1610).

Simancas, Diego, *De Catholicis institutionibus liber, ad praecavendas et extirpandas haereses admodum necessarius*, tertio nunc editus (Rome: In Aedibus Populi Romani, 1575).

Speroni, Sperone, *Apologia dei Dialogi*, in id., *Opere*, ed. with introduction by Mario Pozzi, reprint (Milan: Ricciardi, 1978), t. 1.

——— Speroni, *Sopra l'Ariosto*, in *Opere di m. Sperone Speroni degli Alvarotti, tratte da' mss originali* (Venice: Domenico Occhi, 1740), t. 5.

——— *Dialoghi*, di nuovo ricoretti, a' quali sono aggiunti molti altri non più stampati e di più l'apologia de i primi (Venice: Roberto Meietti, 1596).

——— *I Dialogi di Messer Sperone Speroni* (Venice: Aldo Manuzio, 1544).

——— *Dialoghi* (Venice: Aldo Manuzio, 1542).

Springer, Jakob and Institoris, Heinrich, *Der Hexenhammer*, trans. J.W.R. Schmidt (Erftstadt: Area, 2005).

Tasso, Torquato, *Prose*, ed. by Ettore Mazzali (Milan: Ricciardi, 1959).

——— *Opere*, ed. Bruno Maier (Milan: Rizzoli, 1963–1964), 4 vols.

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, in id., *Opera omnia*, ed. by Roberto Busa SJ (Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt: Frommann und Holzboog, 1980), t. 2.

——— *Summa Theologica*, ed. Joseph Pecci, 3rd edn. (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1926).

Torelli, Pomponio, *Trattato della poesia lirica* (*1590*), in *Trattati di poetica e retorica del Cinquecento*, ed. Bernard Weinberg (Rome: Laterza e figli, 1974), iv.

Valier, Agostino, *De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris*, in Giovanni Cipriani, *La mente di un inquisitore. Agostino Valier e l'Opusculum De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris* (*1589–1604*) (Florence: Nicomp Laboratorio Editoriale, 2008).

——— *Convivium Noctium Vaticanarum*, in *Noctes Vaticanae*.

——— *De cautione adhibenda in edendis libris* (Padua: Giuseppe Comino, 1719).

——— *De rhetorica ecclesiastica ad clericos libri tres* (Venice: Andrea Bocchino et fratres, 1574).

Venier, Domenico, *Rime di Domenico Venier senatore viniziano*, raccolte ora per la prima volta ed illustrate dall'Abate Pierantonio Serassi. Si aggiungono alcune Poesie di Maffeo e Luigi Venieri, nipoti dell'Autore (Bergamo: Pietro Lancellotto, 1751).

——— *Rime*, ed. A. Nuovo, Università di Pavia, 1981–82 (tesi laurea), in *Archivio della tradizione lirica da Petrarca a Marino*, ed. by Amedeo Quondam (Rome: Lexis Progetti Ed., 1997).

Vergil, *Eclogae*, ed. H.E. Gould (London: Macmillan, 1976).

——— *Aeneis*, trans. Edith and Gerhard Binder (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1994).

Viperano, Giovan Antonio, *De arte poetica* (Antwerp: Christoffel Plantijn, Architypographi Regii, 1579).

Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca (Venice: Giovanni Alberti, 1612).

Willaert, Adrian, *Musica nova* (Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1559).

2 Secondary Sources

Agnelli, Giuseppe and Ravegnani, Giuseppe, *Annali delle edizioni ariostee*, con CXIV tavole fuori testo (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1933).

Ambrosini, Federica, *Storie di patrizi e di eresie nella Venezia del Cinquecento* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1999).

Ascoli, Albert Russell, *Dante and the Making of a Modern Author* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch, ed. H. Georges (thirteenth edn., Hanover: Hahn, 1972).

Baldassari, Guido and Bianco, Monica, 'Officina padovana', in Quondam, *Petrarca in barocco*, 327–44.

Baldini, Ugo, 'The Roman Inquisition's Condemnation of Astrology: Antecedents, Reasons, and Consequences', in Fragnito, *Church, Censorship and Culture*, 80–110.

Balduino, Armando, 'Petrarchismo veneto e tradizione manoscritta', in *Petrarca, Venezia e il Veneto*, ed. Giorgio Padoan (Florence: Olschki, 1976), 243–70.

Banz, Claudia, *Höfisches Mäzenatentum in Brüssel: Kardinal Antoine Perrenoto de Granvelle (1517–1586) und die Erzherzöge Albrecht (1559–1621) und Isabella (1566–1633)* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2000).

Baron, Hans, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 1967).

Bartuschat, Johannes, 'Le Triomphe de Vénus et de la poésie: autour des *Stanze*', *Italique: poésie italienne de la Renaissance* 14 (2011), 175–204.

——— 'Il ritratto di Laura (RVF 76–80)', in *Il Canzoniere. Lettura micro e macrotestuale*, ed. Michelangelo Picone (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 2007), 207–23.

Baruffaldi, Girolamo, *La vita di m. Lodovico Ariosto* (Ferrara: Bianchi e Negri, 1807).

Bayer, Oswald, *Gott als Autor. Zu einer poietologischen Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

Bernsen, Michael, *Die Problematisierung lyrischen Sprechens im Mittelalter. Eine Untersuchung zum Diskurswandel der Liebesdichtung von den Provenzalen bis zu Petrarca* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2001).

Bertolini, Manuel, 'Poesia, musica, censura. Testi italiani del XVI e del XVII secolo', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, 46 (2010), 273–301.

Bianco, Monica, 'Le Rime di Domenico Venier', PhD diss. (University of Padua, 2000).

——— and Baldassari, Guido, 'Officina padovana', in Quondam, *Petrarca in barocco*, 327–44.

——— 'Quarentena guittoniana in un autografo di Domenico Venier', *Medioevo romanzo*, 32 (2008), 85–115.

——— 'Domenico Venier e l'epitaffio di Pietro Aretino', *Quaderni veneti* 41 (2005), 129–36.

Biase, Alfredo M. De S.J., 'Bellarmino e Dante', *Gregorianum*, 2/4 (1921), 589–613.

Bornkamm, Günter, *Mythos und Legende in den apokryphen Thomas-Akten. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gnosis und zur Vorgeschichte des Manichäismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933).

Brown, H.F., *The Venetian Printing Press* (London: Nimmo, 1891).

Brown, Peter M., 'I veri promotori della "rassettatura" del *Decameron* nel 1582', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 134 (1957), 314–32.

Burckhardt, Jacob, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Vienna: Phaidon-Verlag, 1922).

Burrus, Virginia, *The Making of a Heretic. Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

Caesar, Michael, *Dante. The Critical Heritage. 1314(?)–1870* (London: Routledge, 1989).

Cantimori, Delio, in *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento*, ed. Adriano Prosperi (2nd edn., Turin: Einaudi, 1992).

Cardini, Franco and Vasoli, Cesare, 'Rinascimento e Umanesimo', in *Storia della letteratura italiana*, ed. Enrico Malato, iii: *Il '400* (Rome: Salerno, 1996).

Carminati, Clizia, *Giovanni Battista Marino tra inquisizione e censura* (Rome: Antenore, 2008).

Cerrón Puga, María Luisa, 'Censure incrociate fra Italia e Spagna: il caso di Petrarca (1559–1747)', *Critica del testo*, VI/1 (2003), 221–56.

Chadwick, Henry, *Priscillian of Avila. The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Cheneval, Francis, *Die Rezeption der Monarchia Dantes bis zur Editio princeps im Jahre 1559. Metamorphosen eines philosophischen Werkes. Mit einer kritischen Edition von Guido Vernanis Tractatus de potestate summi pontificis* (Munich: Fink, 1995).

Chessa, Silvia, *Il profumo del sacro nel Canzoniere di Petrarca* (Florence: Società Editrice Fiorentina, 2005).

Chiecchi, Giuseppe, *Dolcemente dissimulando: cartelle Laurenziane e* Decameron *censurato* (*1573*) (Padua: Antenore, 1992).

——— and Luciano Troisio, *Il Decameron sequestrato: le tre edizioni censurate nel Cinquecento* (Milan: Unicopli, 1984).

Cian, Vittorio, 'Un episodio della storia della censura in Italia nel secolo XVI: l'edizione spurgata del Cortigiano', *Archivio storico Lombardo*, 2nd ser., 14/4 (1887), 661–727.

Clough, Cecil H., *Pietro Bembo's Library as Represented Particularly in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1965).

Congar, Yves, *L'écclesiologie du haut Moyen Age. De Saint Grégoire le Grand à la désunion entre Byzance et Rome* (Paris: Editions du cerf, 1968).

Constant, Eric A., 'A Reinterpretation of the Fifth Lateran Council Decree *Apostolici regiminis* (1513)', *Sixteenth-Century Journal*, 33/2 (2002), 353–79.

Coseriu, Annamaria, 'Zensur und Literatur in der italienischen Renaissance des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Baldassar Castigliones *Libro del Cortegiano* als Paradigma', in Alfred Noyer-Weidner (ed.), *Literatur zwischen immanenter Bedingtheit und äußerem Zwang. Zwei Studien zum Cinquecento* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1987).

Dagenais, John, *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the 'Libro del Buen Amor'* (Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 1994).

Dall'Orto, Giovanni, ' "Socratic love" as a Disguise for Same-Sex Love in the Italian Renaissance', in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in the Renaissance and*

Enlightenment Europe, Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (eds.) (New York: Haworth Press, 1989), 33–65.

Daniélou, Jean, 'Les origines de l'épiphanie et les Testimonia', *Recherches de sciences religieuses*, 52/1 (1964), 538–53.

Del Col, Andrea, 'Il Nunzio Giovanni Della Casa e l'Inquisizione di Venezia', in Stefano Carrai (ed), *Giovanni Della Casa ecclesiastico e scrittore*, Atti del convegno Firenze—Borgo San Lorenzo, 20–22 novembre 2003 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2007), 1–30.

Denzler, Georg, *Kardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514–1585). Ein Beitrag zur nachtridentinischen Reform* (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1964).

Deproost, Paul-Augustin, ' "Ficta et facta". La condemnation du "mensonge des poètes" dans la poésie latine chrétienne', *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 44 (1998), 101–21.

Deramaix, Marc, ' "Inepta et indecora comparatio: sacris prophana miscere". Une censure ecclésiastique post-tridentine et inédite du *De partu Virginis* de Jacopo Sannazaro', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, juin (1991), 172–93.

Dizionario storico dell'Inquisizione, ed. Adriano Prosperi (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2010).

Drecoll, Volker Henning, *Die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre Augustins* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

Durst, Uwe, *Theorie der phantastischen Literatur* (Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 2001).

Eden, Kathy, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Effe, Bernd, 'Die Homoerotik in der griechischen Bukolik', in Stemmler, 55–67.

Enenkel, Karl A.E., *Die Erfindung des Menschen. Die Autobiographik des frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

Fava Guzzetta, Lia (ed.), *Dante e i papi*. Altissimi cantus: *riflessione a 40 anni dalla Lettera Apostolica di Paolo VI* (Rome: Studium, 2009).

Fedi, Roberto, *La memoria della poesia. Canzonieri, lirici e libri di rime nel Rinascimento* (Rome: Salerno, 1990).

Feldman, Martha, 'The Academy of Domenico Venier', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 44/3 (1991), 476–512.

——— *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

Ferrazzi, Giuseppe Jacopo, *Bibliografia ariostesca* (Bassano: Pozzato, 1881).

Fischel, Henry Albert, *Rabbinic Literature and Graeco-Roman Philosophy: A Study of Epicurea and Rhetorica in Early Midrashic Writings* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

Fitos, Stephan, *Zensur als Misserfolg. Die Verbreitung indizierter deutscher Druckschriften in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2000).

Föcking, Marc, *Rime sacre und die Genese des barocken Stils* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994).

Foster, Kenelm, *The Two Dantes and other Studies* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1977).

Foucault, Michel, '*Was ist ein Autor?*', in *Texte zur Theorie der Autorschaft*, ed. with a commentary by Fotis Jannidis, Gerhard Lauer, Matias Martinez, Simone Winko (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2007).

Fragnito, G., '"Vanissimus et spurchissimus homo": Ariosto all'esame dei censori', in *Dalla bibliografia alla storia. Studi in onore di Ugo Rozzo*, ed. Rudj Gorian (Udine: Forum Edizioni, 2010), 107–29.

——— 'Un archivio conteso: le carte dell'Indice tra Congregazione dell'Indice e Maestro del sacro Palazzo', *Rivista storica italiana*, 119 (2007), 1276–318.

——— *Proibito capire: la Chiesa e il volgare nella prima età moderna* (Bologna: il Mulino, 2005).

——— 'Gli affanni della censura ecclesiastica', *Rivista storica italiana*, 114/2 (August 2002), 584–600.

——— (ed.), *Church, Censorship, and Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

——— 'Li libbri non zò rrobba da cristiano: la letteratura italiana e l'indice di Clemente VIII (1596)', *Schifanoia: notizie dell'Istituto di Studi Rinascimentali di Ferrara*, 19 (1999), 123–35.

——— *La Bibbia al rogo. La censura ecclesiastica e i volgarizzamenti della Scrittura (1471–1605)*, (Bologna: Il Mulino: 1997).

——— 'La censura libraria tra Congregazione dell'Indice, Congregazione dell'Inquisizione e Maestro del Sacro Palazzo (1571–1596)', in *La censura libraria nell'Europa del secolo XVI*, ed. Ugo Rozzo (Udine: Forum, 1997), 163–75.

——— 'Aspetti e problemi della censura espurgatoria', in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici*, 161–78.

Frajese, Vittorio, *Nascita dell'Indice: la censura ecclesiastica dal Rinascimento alla Controriforma* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2006).

——— 'La politica dell'Indice dal Tridentino al Clementino (1571–1596)', *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà*, XI (1998), 269–356.

Frapolli, Massimo, 'Un micro-canzoniere di Domenico Venier in antologia', *Quaderni veneti*, 33 (2001), 29–68.

Gaudemet, Jean, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de léglise aux IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles* (Paris: Sirey, 1957).

Geyer, Paul, 'Petrarca *Canzoniere* als Bewusstseinsroman', in id., and Kerstin Thorwarth (eds.), *Petrarca und die Herausbildung des modernen Subjekts* (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2009), 109–54.

Gilbert, Felix, 'Cristianesimo, umanesimo e la Bolla 'Apostolici Regiminis' del 1513', *Rivista storica italiana*, 90 (1967), 976–90.

Glei, Reinhold F., 'Das leere Grab und die Macht der Bilder. Vergil-Rezeption in der *Christias* des Marco Girolamo Vida', in Thorsten Burkhard and Markus Schauer (eds.), *Vestigia Vergiliana: Vergil-Rezeption in der Neuzeit*, (2nd edn., Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 107–20.

Godman, Peter, *Die geheime Inquisition. Aus den verbotenen Archiven des Vatikans*, trans. Monika Noll, and Ulrich Enderwitz (Wiesbaden: Marix, 2005).

——— *Weltliteratur auf dem Index. Die geheimen Gutachten des Vatikans* (Berlin: Propyläen, 2001).

——— *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Grant, William Leonard, *Neo-Latin Literature and the Pastoral* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965).

Greek-English Lexicon, compiled by Henry George Liddell, and Robert Scott, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

Grendler, Paul F., 'The Adages of Paolo Manuzio: Erasmus and the Roman Censors', in James V. Mehl (ed.), *In laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation Studies for Charles J. Nauert* (Kirksville, Mo.: Thomas Jefferson Univ. Press, 1998), 1–21.

——— *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Printing Press* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

Helm, Jennifer, 'Dante and the Authority of Knowledge' (forthcoming).

——— 'Literary Censorship: The Case of the *Orlando furioso*', *La censura ecclesiastica in età moderna, Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica*, 1 (2012), 193–214.

——— 'Annäherung an die römisch-katholische Lesart volkssprachlicher Poesie in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts—ein Einblick in die gegenreformatorische Zensur', in *Zeichen setzen—Konvention, Kreativität, Interpretation*, Beiträge zum 24. Forum Junge Romanistik, Tübingen 14. bis 17. Mai 2008 (Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2009), 415–34.

——— 'Philologie, Übersetzungen und das Dekret *Inter sollicitudines* zur Vorzensur (1515)', in Christoph Strosetzki (ed.), *Übersetzung—Ursprung und Zukunft der Philologie?*, (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2008), 195–212.

Hempfer, Klaus W., and Regn, Gerhard (eds.), *Petrarca-Lektüren*. Gedenkschrift für Alfred Noyer-Weidner (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003).

Hilgers, Joseph, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1904).

Iannucci, Amilcare A., 'Dante's Limbo at the Margins of Orthodoxy', in *Dante and the Unorthodox*, ed. James Miller (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfried Laurier University Press, 2005), 63–82.

L'Inquisizione e gli storici, un cantiere aperto, Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2000).

Jacobsen Schutte, Anne, 'The *Lettere Volgari* and the Crisis of Evangelism in Italy', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 28 (1975), 639–88.

Kallendorf, Craig, *The Virgilian Tradition. Book History and the History of Reading in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Karrer, Otto and Piesch, Herma, *Meister Eckharts Rechtfertigungsschrift vom Jahre 1326* (Erfurt: Kurt Strenger, 1927).

Kidwell, Carol, *Pontano: Poet and Prime Minister* (London: Duckworth, 1991).

Kisacky, Julia M., *Magic in Boiardo and Ariosto* (New York: Lang, 2000).

König, Bernhard, 'Sole e oscurità. Su significato e funzione "architettonico" di un motivo iconografico nel *Canzoniere* di Petrarca', *Quaderni petrarcheschi*, 14 (2004), 125–45.

Küpper, Joachim, 'Palinodia e polisemia nella canzone alla Vergine del Canzoniere. (Con alcune brevi considerazioni sulle condizioni della differenza tra arte classica ed arte moderna)', *Quaderni petrarcheschi*, 14 (2004), 147–90.

Le pouvoir et la plume: Incitation, contrôle et répression dans l'Italie du XVI^e siècle, Actes du Colloque international organisé par le Centre interuniversitaire de Recherche sur la Renaissance italienne (Paris: Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1982).

Letteratura italiana. Gli autori. Dizionario bio-bibliografico e Indici, ed. Alberto Asor Rosa (Turin: Einaudi, 1990).

Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, ed. Josef Höfer, and Karl Rahner (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1957).

L'Inquisizione romana: metodologia delle fonti e storia istituzionale, Atti del Seminario internazionale, Montereale Valcellina, 23 e 24 settembre 1999, ed. Andrea Del Col et al. (Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste, 2000).

Longo, Nicola, 'Fenomeni di censura nella letteratura italiana del Cinquecento', in *Le pouvoir et la plume*, 275–84.

Matthews, John, *The Element of the Arthurian Tradition* (Londmead: Element, 1989).

Meier, Christel, '*Ut rebus apta sint verba*. Überlegungen zu einer Poetik des Wunderbaren im Mittelalter', in Schmidtke, 37–83.

Milman, Henry H., *History of Latin Christianity: Including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V* (4th edn., London: Murray, 1867).

Minnis, Alistair J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literariy Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (2nd edn., Aldershot: Wildwood House, 1988).

Mirto, Alfonso, 'Un inedito del Seicento sull'Inquisizione', *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 1/1 (1986), 99–138.

Mordenti, Raul, 'Le due censure: la collazione dei testi del *Decameron* "rassettati" da Vincenzo Borghini e Lionardo Salviati', in *Le pouvoir et la plume*, 253–73.

Müller, Ulrich, 'Merlin', in id., and Werner Wunderlich (ed.), *Verführer, Schurken, Magier* (St. Gallen, UVK: Fachverlag für Wissenschaft und Studium 2001), 663–82.

Muresu, Gabriele, 'Tradimento dei simoniaci (Inferno XIX)', *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, 68/69 (1994), 5–30.

Neuschäfer, Anne, *Lodovico Dolce als dramatischer Autor im Venedig des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2004).

Norton, Rictor, *The Homosexual Literary Tradition: An Interpretation* (New York: Revisionist Press, 1974).

Noyer-Weidner, Alfred, 'Il nome di Laura nel *Canzoniere* petrarchesco: intorno all'enigma onomastico del sonetto V ed alle sue funzioni poetiche', in *Literarhistorische Begegnungen*. Festschrift zum sechzigsten Geburtstag von Bernhard König, ed. by Andreas Kablitz and Ulrich Schulz-Buschhaus (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993), 293–309.

Nuovo, Angela and Coppens, Christian, *I Gioliti e la stampa nell'Italia del XVI secolo* (Geneva: Droz, 2005).

Oort, Johannes van, '*Civitas Dei—terrena civitas*. The Concept of the Two Antithetical Cities and Its Source (Books XI–XIV)', in *Augustinus: De Civitate Dei*, ed. Christoph Horn (Berlin: Akademischer Verlag, 1997), 157–70.

Owens, Jessie Ann, and Richard G. Agee, 'La stampa della Musica Nova di Willaert', *Rivista italiana di musicologia*, 24/2 (1990), 219–305.

Oxford Latin Dictionary, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004).

Padoan, Giorgio (ed.), *Il pio Enea, l'empio Ulisse. Tradizione classica e intendimento medievale in Dante* (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1977).

——— *Petrarca, Venezia e il Veneto* (Florence: Olschki, 1976).

Panella, Antonio, 'L'introduzione a Firenze dell'Indice di Paolo IV', *Rivista storica degli archivi toscani*, 1 (1929), 11–25.

Passarelli, Maria Antonietta, 'Ein Beispiel für die Zensur vulgärsprachlicher Texte: Simone Fórnaris Kommentar zum *Orlando furioso*', in Wolf, *Inquisition, Index, Zensur*, 279–291.

——— 'Petrarca *scelestus auctor* in una censura (non più anonima) di Gabriele Barri (ms. Vat. lat. 6149), ff. 142r–150v)', *Critica del testo*, VI/1 (2003), 177–220.

Pax, Elpidius, *Epiphaneia: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie* (Munich: Zink, 1995).

Penzenstadler, Franz, ' "Sì come eterna vita è veder Dio" (*Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* Nr. 191)—Petrarcas Dekonstruktion stilnovistischer Poetik', in Hempfer and Regn, 147–183.

Pesenti, Giuliano, 'Libri censurati a Venezia nei secoli XVI–XVII', *La Bibliofilia*, 58 (1956), 15–30.

Picone, Michelangelo, ' "Per Ovidio parla d'amore . . ." Dante "auctor" della *Vita nova*', in *Studi in onore di Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo per i suoi settant'anni*, a cura degli allievi padovani (Tavarnuzze, Florence: SISMEL, 2007), i, 237–52.

Pierazzo, Elena, 'Nel laboratoio del censore: Girolamo Giovannini da Capugnano, editore della Zucca del Doni', in *Storia della lingua e filologia* (Tavarnuzze, Florence: SISMEL, 2004), 291–311.

Pohlig, Matthias et al. (eds.), *Säkularisierungen in der Frühen Neuzeit: methodische Probleme und empirische Fallstudien* (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot), 2008.

Prosperi, Adriano, 'Censurare le favole', in *Il romanzo*, ed. Franco Moretti, i: *La cultura del romanzo* (Turin: Einaudi, 2001), 71–106.

Quaglioni, Diego, 'La prova del miracolo. Spunti dalla dottrina di diritto comune', in *Notai, miracoli e culto dei santi. Pubblicità e autenticazione del sacro tra XII e XV secolo*, Atti del seminario internazionale (Rome, 5–7 dicembre 2002), ed. R. Michetti (Milan: Giuffré, 2004), 97–114.

——— 'I miracoli tra teologia e diritto', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religios*a, 42/3 (2006), 459–505.

Quétif, Jacques and Échard, Jacques, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, reprint (New York: Burt Franklin, 1960).

Quondam, A., 'La letteratura in tipografia', in *Letteratura italiana*, ii: *Produzione e consumo*, ed. A. Asor Rosa (Turin: Einaudi, 1983), 555–686.

——— (ed.), *Le* carte messaggiere*. Retorica e modelli di comunicazione epistolare: per un indice dei libri di lettere nel Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1981).

Ragagli, Simone, ' "Né contra la religione né i buoni costume." Alcune osservazioni su censura ecclesiastica e *Lettere volgari* nel secondo Cinquecento', *Rivista di Storia e letteratura Religiosa*, 1 (2005), 193–219.

Rahlenbeck, Charles, *Les subtils moyens par le Cardinal Grandvelle avec ses complices inventez pour instituer l'Inquisition* (Bruxelles: Ch. Muquardt, 1866).

Ray, Meredith K., *Writing gender in Women's Letter Collections of the Italian Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

Regn, Gerhard, *Torquato Tassos zyklische Liebeslyrik und die petrarkistische Tradition. Studien zur* Parte prima *der* Rime *(1591/1592)* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1987).

Reusch, Heinrich, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Literaturgeschichte* (Bonn: Cohen, 1883), 2 vols.

Rhodes, Dennis E., *Silent Printers. Anonymous Printing at Venice in the Sixteenth Century* (London: British Library, 1995).

Richards, Earl Jeffrey, 'Christine de Pizan and the Freedom of Medieval French Lyric: Authority, Experience, and Women in the Republic of Letters', in *Christine de Pizan and Medieval French Lyric*, ed. id. (Gainsville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1998).

Rose, Herbert J., *The Eclogues of Vergil* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1942).

Rotondò, Antonio, 'Nuovi documenti per la storia dell'*Indice dei libri proibiti* (1572–1638)', *Rinascimento*, 2/3 (1963), 145–211.

Rozzo, Ugo, *La letteratura italiana negli* Indici *del Cinquecento* (Udine: Forum, 2005).

——— 'Italian Literature on the Index', in Fragnito, *Church, Censorship, and Culture*, 194–222.

——— (ed.), *La censura libraria nell'Europa del secolo XVI*, Convegno internazionale di studi, Cividale del Friuli 9/10 Novembre 1995 (Udine: Forum, 1997).

——— *Biblioteche italiane del Cinquecento tra Riforma e Controriforma* (Udine: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 1994).

——— *Linee per una storia dell'editoria religiosa in Italia* (*1465–1600*) (Udine: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 1993).

Samaritani, Antonio, *Religione cittadina, autoriforma cattolica, malessere ereticale a Cento nel secolo XVI tra Estensi e Controriforma* (Ferrara: Corbo, 1997).

Santagata, Marco, *Amate e amanti. Figure della lirica amorosa fra Dante e Petrarca* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1999).

Sberlati, Francesco, *Il genere e la disputa. La poetica tra Ariosto e Tasso* (Rome: Bulzoni, 2001).

——— 'La pia ecdotica. L'edizione censurata degli *Inferni* di Anton Francesco Doni', *Lettere italiane*, 49/1 (1997), 3–39.

Scharff, Thomas, 'Schrift zur Kontrolle—Kontrolle der Schrift. Italienische und französische Inquisitoren-Handbücher des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 52 (1996), 547–84.

Scharold, Irmgard, *Vom Wunderbaren zum Phantas(ma)tischen: Zur Archäologie vormoderner Phantastik-Konzeptionen bei Ariost und Tasso* (Munich: Fink, 2012).

Schmidtke, Dietrich (ed.), *Das Wunderbare in der mittelalterlichen Literatur* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1994).

Schwedt, H., *Censor censorum*, *gesammelte Aufsätze von Hermann Schwedt*, Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006).

Scribner, Robert F., 'Reformation and Desacralization. From Sacramental World to Moralised Universe', in *Problems in the Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Europe*, ed. Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, and id. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997), 75–92.

Seidel Menchi, Silvana, 'Sette modi di censurare Erasmo', in Rozzo, *La censura libraria*, 177–206.

Sorrentino, Andrea, *La letteratura italiana e il Sant'Uffizio* (Naples: Libreria Editrice Francesco Perella S.A., 1935).

Stahl, Karl-Heinz, *Das Wunderbare als Problem und Gegenstand der deutschen Poetik des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/ Main: Athenaion, 1975).

Stemmler, Theo (ed.), *Homoerotische Lyrik*, 6. Kolloquium der Forschungsstelle für europäische Lyrik des Mittelalters (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1992).

Stierle, Karlheinz, 'Säkularisierung und Ästhetisierung im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit', in Silvio Vietta and Herbert Uerlings (eds.), *Ästhetik, Religion, Säkularisierung*, vol. 1: *Von der Renaissance zur Romantik* (Paderborn: Fink, 2008), 55–74.

Stroh, Wilfried, ' "Musa puerilis". Die Knabenliebe in der klassischen Dichtung der Römer', in Stemmler, 69–87.

Suitner, Franco, 'La poesia medievale dedicata alla Madonna: qualche aspetto tematico', *Rivista di letteratura italiana*, 25/2 (2007), 9–23.

Summer-Schindler, Wiltrud, *Zensur und Involution. Aspekte gegenreformatorischer Überformung der italienischen Renaissancenovelle* (Aachen: Shaker, 1998).

Taddeo, Edoardo, *Il manierismo letterario e i lirici del tardo Cinquecento* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1974).

Todorov, Tzvetan, *Einführung in die fantastische Literatur* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1972).

Trottmann, Christian, *La vision béatifique: des disputes scolastiques à sa définition par Benoît XII* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1995).

Vedova, Giuseppe, *Biografia degli scrittori padovani* (Padua: Minerva, 1836).

Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae, ed. Otto Gradewitz and others (Berolini: Reimeri, 1939).

Wolf, Hubert, *Index. Der Vatikan und die verbotenen Bücher* (Munich: Beck, 2006).

——— *Inquisition, Index und Zensur: Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001.

Wortkonkordanz zum Decretum Gratiani, ed. Timothy Reuter, and Gabriel Silagi (Munich: Monumenta germaniae Historica, 1990).

Wünsch, Marianne, *Die Fantastische Literatur der Frühen Moderne (1890–1930). Definition, denkgeschichtlicher Kontext, Strukturen* (Munich: Fink, 1991).

Zaiser, Rainer, *Die Epiphanie in der französischen Literatur. Zur Entmystifizierung eines religiösen Erlebnismusters* (Tübingen: Rainer, 1995).

Internet Sources

Largaiolli, Matteo, 'La Predica d'amore: note sulla parodia sacra tra Quattro e Cinquecento', *Italique* [En ligne], XI | 2008, mis en ligne le 01 février 2012 http://italique.revues.org/210, accessed 13 October 2012.

Second Vatican Council, *Dogmatische Konstitution Dei Verbum über die göttliche Offenbarung*, iv, 14 <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html>, accessed 31 March 2013.

The New American Bible <http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0839/_INDEX.HTM>, accessed 31 March 2013.

Index of Names

Absternius, Laurentius 126
Acacius (Patriarch of Constantinople) 212–214
Aesop 126
Albertino, Arnaldo 58, 103
Alighieri, Dante 12
Alunno, Francesco 125, 149, 196, 207, 327, 351–352, 355, 360, 391–392
Anastasius I (emperor) 213
Anastasius II (pope) 212–215
Antoniano, Silvio 36, 64 n. 6, 75–76
Aretino, Pietro 42, 95, 140–141, 190–191, 231, 251–252, 274, 278, 341, 359, 365, 377–378, 395, 409
Arienti, Giovanni Sabadino degli 197, 366
Ariosto, Ludovico viii, xi, 12, 14–15, 47–50, 68, 71–73, 75–76, 79–80, 83–89, 99–103, 115–116, 125–126, 128, 133–134, 136, 141, 153, 161–164, 166, 173–175, 177, 183, 196, 206–207, 219, 221–229, 305307, 326–329, 338, 351–352
Aristippos of Cyrene 168
Aristophanes 126
Aristotle 79, 85, 90, 166, 204, 206, 246, 344, 379, 381
Augustine of Hippo (saint) 18–19, 39, 58, 66, 67, 80–81, 112–114, 120, 169, 175, 246

Bandello, Matteo 187–188, 197, 233, 366, 409
Barbaro, Daniele 143, 294
Baronio, Cesare 37
Barrio, Gabriele 11–16, 33–34, 36, 53, 58, 84, 93–99, 103–107, 114, 116, 119–123, 141–142, 146, 153–162, 164, 166–174, 178, 182–183, 185, 194, 200, 205–206, 208–212, 214–226, 228–229, 291, 296, 305 n. 20, 306–308, 326
Bellarmine, Robert (saint) 37, 44, 138, 142–143, 153, 165, 181, 185, 208–217, 219–220
Bembo, Pietro 12–14, 49–51, 53–55, 116–118, 126, 141, 153, 161–166, 173, 175–176, 180, 192, 233, 239–240, 245, 251, 254–255, 258–259, 264–265, 271 n. 82, 274, 282, 284, 293, 305–308
Bentivoglio, Ercole 351
Bernardo of Como (Bernardo Rategno) 27, 60, 65–66, 78, 80
Berni, Francesco 141, 233
Bianchi, Arcangelo de' 60
Boccaccio, Giovanni viii, 5, 10, 12, 14, 53–54, 112, 125, 141–143, 190, 192, 196, 206–207, 219–220, 370
Boiardo, Matteo Maria xiii
Bonardo, Vincenzo 35–38, 45, 54, 59, 110, 125, 366
Bonfigli, Nicolò Aurifico 369
Boniface VIII (pope) 215
Borromeo, Carlo (saint) 23, 75 n. 31, 151–152, 181, 199, 246
Brucioli, Antonio 126

Calmo, Andrea 187–188, 381
Camerarius, Joachim 126
Cantiuncula, Claudius 126
Cardano, Girolamo 409
Cardona, Juan Bautista 60
Carena, Cesare 59
Caro, Annibale 190, 192, 370
Carpi, Rodolfo Pio da 16
Castelvetro, Lodovico 90–93, 154, 160, 173, 199, 206, 344
Castiglione, Baldassare viii, 266–267
Castro, Alfonso de 144, 168
Cato, Dionysius 126
Catullus 8, 126, 166
Celestine (pope, saint) 209–210, 214
Ceno, Ascanio de' Mori da 197
Centorio degli Ortensi, Ascanio 197
Cervini, Marcello (pope) 16
Chacón, Alfonso 217–219, 392
Châtellion, Sébastien 126
Christ, Jesus 27, 39, 97, 105, 107, 118, 152, 154–159, 162, 168, 170, 172, 179–181, 183, 217, 241, 251, 259–263
Ciccarelli, Antonio 156–157, 162, 364–365, 398
Cicero 39, 58, 126, 150, 188, 206
Ciocchi del Monte, Gian Maria 15–16 (see Julius III)

Clement V (pope) 215
Clement VIII (pope) vii, 140, 197, 403
Constabile, Paolo 21, 45–47, 49–51, 115–116, 139–141, 143, 146, 152, 160, 184–185, 187, 189–190, 193, 196–197, 292–293, 296, 306–307, 327, 352, 366
Cordus, Euricius 126
Corso, Antonio Giacomo 240–241, 266
Cousin, Gilbert 126
Cratander, Andreas 126

Da Mosto, Marina 253, 266
De Franceschi, Francesco 126–131
Della Casa, Giovanni 369
Di Dio, Giovanni 45–47, 49, 51, 139–141, 143, 185, 189–190, 351–353, 370
Dionigi, Francesco 197
Dolce, Lodovico 112, 132, 232, 266, 351, 365
Doni, Antonfrancesco viii, 145, 351–353, 355, 381
Drusius, Johannes 182–183, 305, 308

Epicurus 168
Erizzo, Sebastiano 197, 231–232
Eymerich, Nicholas 24 n. 22, 59, 66, 120, 143, 210, 217

Fabri, Sisto 111, 398
Felix III (pope) 212
Fero, Giovanni 409
Ficino, Marsilio 5, 250, 280
Filippi, Paolo 67
Firenzuola, Agnolo 197
Folengo, Teofilo (Merlin Cocai) 351, 353–355, 361, 365
Fornari, Simon viii, 87, 343
Foucault, Michel 33
Franco, Veronica 187–188
Fuchs, Johann 409

Galesini, Pietro 44, 199–200
Galletti, Tommaso 58, 70, 326, 329, 335
Gerbel, Nikolaus 126
Gerson, Jean 60
Gessner, Conrad 126
Gherardo, Paolo 112, 370, 372
Ghislieri, Michele 22, 37, 113
Giovio, Paolo 111
Giustinian, Orsatto 108–109
Giustinian, Paolo 2–5, 12, 77
Gonzaga, Cesare 266–267
Gonzaga, Luigi 327, 337
Gozze, Niccolò Vito de 156, 398
Granvelle, Antoine Perenot de 15–16, 81
Gratianus 211, 213
Gregory of Naples 60, 125
Gregory the Great (saint) 58, 120–121, 150, 172
Gregory XIII (pope) 66 n. 13
Gretser, Jakob 198
Grillando, Paolo 59, 66
Grynaeus, Simon 126
Guarini da Centula, Vincenzo 90–93, 102, 206, 379, 381
Guglielmo, Sirleto 15–16, 47

Hegendorph, Christoph 126
Hesiod 126, 149
Hessus, Helius Eobanus 126
Heyl, Johann 126
Horace 126, 185, 203

Jacob (Patriarch) 119, 171–172
John (saint) 27, 116, 182, 210, 222–225, 228, 256
John XXII 65, 210, 215
Julius II 1, 3–4
Julius III (see Ciocchi del Monte) 11–12, 15, 160, 306
Junius, Hadrianus 126

Leah 170–172
Leo X (pope) 1–6, 8, 11, 16, 18, 30, 261, 280
López de Palacios Rubios, Juan 59
Lucian of Samosata 138
Lucretius 9
Luke (saint) 154
Luther, Martin 224

Machiavelli, Niccolò 112
Magno, Celio 108–109, 236–237, 277
Malespini, Celio 197
Malipiero, Girolamo 51–53, 236
Manfredi, Girolamo 369
Manriquez, Tomas 197
Mantova Benavides, Marco 344, 351

Manuzio, Aldo 112, 126, 187
Manuzio, Paolo 132, 189, 231–232, 370
Marcantonio Marcello 90–93, 96, 380
Martial 8, 42, 126
Mary 100, 158–159, 164, 172, 183, 249, 251, 259, 264, 279, 310, 319, 325–326
Mary Magdalene 170–171, 249, 378
Matthew (saint) 180, 199
Melanchthon, Philipp 126
Menghi, Girolamo 26–27, 69, 77–78, 80–81, 87, 114–115, 120
Mercati, Michele 205–206
Merlin 58, 85–89, 126
Micyllus, Jacobus 126
Minturno, Antonio Sebastiano 63, 70, 185–186, 194, 202–204, 221
Molin, Girolamo 242–243, 261–262, 266, 278
Montaigne, Michel de 21, 111, 292
Montemayor, Jorge de 110, 112

Nicholas III (pope) 215–217

Olivi, Peter John 210
Opsopoeus, Vincentius 126
Origen 25, 89, 156
Ottonelli, Giulio 89
Ovid 126, 141

Paleotti, Gabriele 25–26, 56, 68, 221, 225, 228, 326
Parabosco, Girolamo 140, 187, 189, 366
Pasqualigo, Luigi 187, 189, 193
Paul (saint) 28, 58, 144, 179, 249
Paul III 15, 24
Paul IV 30, 41, 46
Paul V 38
Peña, Francisco 24 n. 22, 27, 59–60, 78, 80, 121, 143
Persius 126
Peter (saint) 170–171
Petrarch, Francis xi, 10, 12–13, 15, 33, 51–55, 58, 96–98, 103, 110, 113, 116, 119–123, 140–143, 152–155, 157–162, 166–173, 175–178, 180, 183, 186, 188, 194–196, 205–206, 221, 235–237, 243, 251, 254, 258, 260, 265, 292, 305–307, 344, 379
Photinus of Thessaly 213
Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 126
Pico, Paolo 21 n. 17, 67, 68 n. 19
Pindar 126, 206
Platina, il (Sacchi, Bartolomeo) 409
Plato 156, 162, 180
Plautus 126
Plutarch 126
Porcacchi, Tommaso 127, 131
Possevino, Antonio 23, 25–26, 60, 89
Priscillian of Avila 121
Prudentius 126
Pulci, Luigi 9, 145

Quemada, Gabriel de 60
Querini, Piero 2–5, 12, 77, 261
Quintilian 126

Rachel 119, 170–172
Rao, Cesare 188
Rebiba, Scipione 45, 354, 361
Ronsard, Pierre 76, 134
Rossi, Damiano Rubeo de 296
Ruscelli, Girolamo 132, 231–234, 246, 250, 253

Sabinus, Georg 126
Sallust 126
Sannazaro, Jacopo 9, 11–12, 14–15, 49–50, 57, 91, 93–96, 114, 117–118, 126, 146, 153, 161–162, 165–166, 173, 176–179, 183, 205, 255, 263, 298 n. 18, 305, 307
Sansovino, Francesco 126, 161, 180, 187, 190–193, 196, 212, 232, 298 n. 18, 351, 366
Scaglia, Desiderio 38
Scaliger, Julius Caesar 205
Secco, Zuanantonio 261, 266
Seneca 58, 114, 126
Silva, Feliciano de 67
Simancas, Diego 25, 66, 89
Sixtus V (pope) 25, 32, 57, 60, 121, 139 n. 7, 140, 197, 199, 201, 209, 403
Sixtus, fra 58, 86
Sleidanus, Johannes 126
Sophocles 126
Speroni, Sperone 21, 89, 178, 292–293, 295
Straparola, Gianfrancesco 196, 366–367
Suetonius 126

Tacitus 126
Tasso, Torquato 75, 83, 160
Tauler, Johannes 182–183, 305, 308
Terence 126, 203
Theocritus 126
Thomas Aquinas 123, 216, 272
Torelli, Pomponio 166, 185 n. 140, 194

Valgrisi, Vincenzo 126–129, 131
Valier, Agostino 23, 117, 151, 352
Venier, Domenico (di Zuan Andrea) vi, xi, 109, 132, 230–279, 285–286
Vignati, Ambrogio 59
Viperano, Giovanni Antonio 81
Virgil 94, 105–106, 120, 126–127, 155, 206, 209, 212, 239, 265, 266, 267

Willaert, Adrian 235

Xenophon 126

Ystella, Ludovico 48, 133